The Dissertation Committee for Kimberly Susan Anderson certifies that this is the approved version of the following dissertation:

BILINGUAL EDUCATION AND THE POLITICS OF CULTURAL CITIZENSHIP IN CALIFORNIA PRE- AND POST-PROPOSITION 227

Committee:

_____
Douglas Foley, Supervisor

_____
Pauline Turner Strong, Co-Supervisor

_____
Charles Hale

_____
Martha Menchaca

_____
Joseph Johnson, Jr.

BILINGUAL EDUCATION AND THE POLITICS OF CULTURAL CITIZENSHIP IN CALIFORNIA PRE- AND POST-PROPOSITION 227

by

Kimberly Susan Anderson, B.A., M.A.

Dissertation

Presented to the Faculty of the Graduate School of
the University Of Texas at Austin
in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements
for the Degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

The University of Texas at Austin

December, 2003

Acknowledgments

I would like to thank the South Central Elementary school community for being open to and receptive of my work and research there over the years. ¡Piensa y Realiza! I would like to thank The Achievement Council for the professional experience and inspiration in the work for excellence and equity for all children and communities. I would like to thank the University of Texas at Austin for providing support for this work in the forms of a Fernea Fellowship (2001-2002), a Thematic Dissertation Fellowship (2000-2001), and Department of Anthropology Professional Development Awards (2000 and 1998); and my dissertation committee members for their guidance. I would like to thank Zi and OmZen for revealing in me the tools I needed to bring this project to fruition. I would like to thank my family for everything, always.

BILINGUAL EDUCATION AND THE POLITICS OF CULTURAL CITIZENSHIP IN CALIFORNIA PRE- AND POST-PROPOSITION 227

Publication No. _____

Kimberly Susan Anderson, Ph.D.
The University of Texas at Austin, 2003

Supervisors: Douglas Foley, Pauline Turner Strong

This dissertation is an exploration of the politics of cultural citizenship in California as manifested on the terrain of debates about bilingual education policy and practice. A multisited ethnography, I followed the politics of cultural citizenship across two sites: locally amongst African-American, Latino and white school community members on a South Central Los Angeles elementary campus and nationally in popular media discourses. I tracked how people talked about and negotiated dynamics of belonging, solidarities and borders, and access to rights, voice, and opportunity. A longitudinal study, I first conducted research in 1996 as the local school dealt with rapid demographic change and the institutionalization of a Spanish-English bilingual program. In 1998-2000 I returned to follow the implementation of California's controversial "English For The Children" Proposition 227. I examined how discourses about language/s in school were coconstitutive with those about immigration, race, culture, nation and struggle for material gain; and how these discourses and policy agendas were complex and shifting across local and national contexts. As a teacher in the school community before and during research I provide an insider's reflections on these heady times of social and pedagogical change, and an account of the activist projects I undertook to facilitate community dialogue about policy, practice and struggles for cultural citizenship. This dissertation contributes to knowledge about key dimensions of

cultural citizenship: about how people imagine community and each others' places within it across local and national sites; about the co-constructed nature of lived experiences of and discourses about language, race, nation/immigration, culture and material competition; and about relationships to policy as both received mandate and local cultural-pedagogical resource—and the implication of these for struggles for equity. It contributes to work in critical studies of cultural production in schools; to work on language, race, ideology and power; and to literature in "native" anthropology and activist/teacher research. It pushes educators, anthropologists and policy makers to consider bilingual education as more than just a "Latino issue," but as a complex constellation of interests and practices at play as communities become increasingly diverse across multiple axes of difference/connection and as they negotiate what the socially legitimate means and ends of the collective are to be, and whose knowledge is of most worth.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION, THEORY, METHODOLOGY

Ms. Anderson, Anthropologist: An Introduction

My journey towards this dissertation in Anthropology began with my journey in the field of Education in 1991. I ask questions about the politics of cultural citizenship, language, race, nation and activism because these are questions that arose for me in my own practice as an educator. I discuss my journey briefly below to provide a context for my research questions and design—to unveil the biography within the ethnography (Behar 1996).

I began teaching in 1991 as part of the Teach For America program, fresh out of college. I was placed in a school district in a neighboring city to Los Angeles. Given that I spoke Spanish I was assigned to a school with a rapidly-growing Latino population. They needed bilingual teachers for the one class on every grade level that now required a bilingual component; there were just under 500 students at the school altogether. I taught the fourth grade "modified" bilingual class, meaning that I had two instructional programs going simultaneously: Half of my students were in the bilingual program, requiring instruction in Spanish and English. These students were all Latino, most immigrants. Half were in the monolingual English fourth grade program. These students were mostly African-American and a few Latino. Apparently, even before school had started several parents pulled their children out of my class and placed them in the other fourth grade class on campus, which was an all English class, because they assumed that bilingual education was "slower than regular education."

While the bilingual program was still in its formative stages there and I received little guidance on policy or curriculum, by the end of the year we had shaken up the school community's assumptions: Not only did many of my bilingual program students transition successfully into the monolingual English fifth grade program (the goal of the district's transitional bilingual program), but a few of my African-American students had actually become conversationally fluent in Spanish (though it was not technically a dual

immersion class, I did structure Spanish language acquisition time for my monolingual English students during my English Learners' ESL time). Seeing this, the principal planned a Gifted and Talented component for the bilingual fourth grade class that he slated me for the next year. However, due to some professional training opportunities available through the Los Angeles Unified School District, I left that school and transferred to the LAUSD the next year.

Just a few months after the 1992 "civil disobedience" I took a position as a third/fourth grade teacher at a school in South Central Lost Angeles (I will call it "South Central Elementary"). I taught there for two years. Of the roughly 1,200 students the vast majority were Latino (mostly immigrants) and a small percentage were African-American. My students were all Latino and all in the bilingual program, which in the LAUSD was also a transitional model: Instruction in core content areas (Language Arts, Math, Social Studies and Science) was conducted in students' native language (Spanish at our school, but bilingual programs were offered in many languages) while intense English as a Second Language lessons were given daily and subjects such as Physical Education, Music and Art utilized English. More English was added as was appropriate to students' growth until they mastered enough to flourish in a monolingual English classroom. At that point they "transitioned" (no official efforts were made to maintain students' native language skills). Also important was an emphasis on the histories and cultures of Latinos and on multicultural pedagogy. In contrast to my first school, at South Central Elementary I received much guidance on bilingual education policy, curriculum, pedagogy. The program was large and growing. Administrators and parents held high expectations for us and the program was seen as fostering high academic achievement.

After a while on campus, however, I began to feel that sense of value around bilingualism as a point of contention. Questions of resources for the bilingual *versus* for the monolingual English (or "EO," English Only) programs often arose. For example, when we voted on the new Title I Program coordinator position--did the candidate need

to be bilingual or not?; and when we voted on curricular materials to be purchased--just how much of the materials should be in Spanish as opposed to in English?

Questions about bilingual education constantly arose in my private life, also. When I mentioned to people what I did they became either very impressed or very agitated, and I was often pressed to answer questions like, Why teach in Spanish when we want them to learn English anyway? What kind of message were we sending to "these immigrants" by "not teaching English"? Don't they want to be American? And, aren't they taking over and aren't you letting them? I became frustrated with what I felt were my simple answers, and I wondered about my own positioning as a white, middle-class teacher in an urban school where I did not look like my students and where I taught in a language that I was not even a native speaker of. I became uncomfortable with my sense of sliding through it all without critically engaging it.

In 1994, upon earning my California Clear Professional teaching credential and my Bilingual Cross-Cultural Language and Academic Development Specialist credential, I was invited by the LAUSD's District Intern Program (the second largest alternative credentialing program in the nation, of which I was a graduate) to become an instructor. At that point I really began to wonder, did I see things critically enough yet to facilitate the growth of *other* new teachers all over the city? I didn't think so. Instead of continuing to slide through, I took a break from teaching to begin graduate study in anthropology.

During my first year of graduate study (1995-1996) I heard from friends at South Central Elementary that since I had been gone, earlier tensions over resources had erupted into full-blown debates about the future of our bilingual program. Right away I called the principal and asked if she would approve my return to campus that summer to conduct research on the controversy. That research first resulted in my 1997 masters thesis entitled, "What should the 'bilingual' in bilingual education mean?: Race, Language and Nation in Debates About Bilingual Education in the United States." As I formulated my dissertation project, that first summer of research became the first phase—and chapters two and three--of this multiyear, multisited, activist, insider ethnographic

exploration of the politics of cultural citizenship as fought on the terrain of debates about bilingual education.

In 1997 and 1998 a massive anti-bilingual education campaign was waged in California, led by the conservative, Republican millionaire Ron Unz. The goals of the campaign were outlined in its legislative form, the Proposition 227 "English For the Children" ballot initiative. 227 garnered national media attention. It sought to outlaw bilingual education statewide and to require that all Limited English Proficient (English Learner) students be taught using the untried, unresearched, controversial, sink-or-swim "Structured Immersion" model. I knew that passions about Proposition 227 would be running high at South Central Elementary and I wanted to know how the initiative would affect the school community politics I had examined in 1996. My friends there told me that teaching positions were opening up for the 1998-1999 school year, so I got on the phone again to the principal.

Returning again to South Central Elementary in August of 1998, just two months after Proposition 227 passed, I saw my dissertation research as a continued, and more in-depth, exploration of questions I began to ask in 1996. I understood my study of the politics of bilingual education policy as constructed through discourses of language, race and nation as really an interrogation of what too often prevents schools from educating *all* of their students at levels of global excellence: dynamics of community. How a school community defines itself, its interests and purpose, its binding solidarities, its boundaries, its membership and its voice informs the way in which people on campus understand and construct reality, how they interact with each other and how they negotiate their roles (Flores and Benmayor 1997:13). This shapes the educational environment in which children are taught, and this in turn affects academic outcomes and the life chances of our children, determining our collective future.

I also understood that with this "round" of research, I wanted its process and outcomes to contribute directly to efforts to bring South Central Elementary to global levels of excellence for all of our students. I wanted be more involved than an anthropologist normally is. Hence, I designed my research in 1998-2000 as an activist,

"insider" project: Different from the 1996 research period, this time I returned not only to conduct research but also to teach. I had to do not only all the things a good anthropologist does (and ethnographic research is full-time work in its own right), but I also signed up to be "Ms. Anderson, room 112." I had the exciting, challenging task of educating third graders at a time when California schools were undergoing the massive, rapid changes brought by Proposition 227.

On top of that, I wore several other hats from 1998-2000: I served as the school's Standards-Based Assessment Coordinator, helping to introduce a new performance assessment system and to increase the rigor in our standards-based instruction. I served on the school's Professional Development Committee, helping to plan and implement training for our faculty. In an effort to increase connections between our school and the neighborhood I founded a high school tutoring program, recruiting students from our feeder high school to tutor our kindergarten through fifth-graders. At one point we had enough tutors to cover almost every class in our school--a few of them having been students of mine from my earlier days at South Central Elementary! At the District level, I worked as an instructor in the District Intern Program, finally coming full circle to the place where I was the first time I left the classroom to study anthropology; I taught Brain-Based Teaching and Learning, and Diversity in Education courses. During some of my vacations I also served as a part time advisor to prospective intern teachers in the District's personnel department. Needless to say, those two years were grueling for me, yet rich, rewarding and productive.

I offer this dissertation as my first attempt at processing the long-term political, personal and community dynamics that I have explored from 1996 through 2000 (and to the present). I offer it as food for thought, debate and action for educators, parents, policymakers, and scholars alike as we struggle to bring excellence and equity to all students and communities. As such I strive to present this text in an engaging, grounded style. I follow bell hooks' (1989) reminder that "to speak in a language accessible to all of us is a political choice about whom we are speaking to, whom we want to hear us, and whom we want to motivate with our words" (cited in Lipman 1998: 21).

Research Questions

I went into research in 1998 with the following questions: 1) How did people at South Central Elementary struggle to the define the community and its parameters for cultural citizenship through debates about the controversial language policies that shifted dramatically in the 1990s, from pre- through post-Proposition 227--how did politics and the educational environment on campus change over time? 2) How did Latino, African-American and white school community members employ discourses about language, immigration, "America," race and power; how did these articulate to widely-circulating media discourses on these topics; what does this illuminate about how they experienced and constructed their relationships to each other and to national-level political discourses and dynamics; and what does this tell us about the co-constructed nature of politics and lived experience at local and national sites? 3) What insights could being a teacher-activist-ethnographer provide on my questions, and could my research contribute to local struggles for cultural citizenship and improved practice during this time of drastic programmatic change?

I hope this dissertation provides a rich, reflective insider's account of changes in bilingual education policy and politics over the last decade as lived in a diverse school community experiencing the kind of demographic and cultural shifts occurring ever-more rapidly nationwide. I aim to illuminate relationships between Policy and local policy processes--between the multiple meanings that a policy can represent, and the various and sometimes surprising interpretations of it as it is actually lived. I want to contribute to understandings of the multiple, competing socio-cultural contexts of schooling; of the local and national structures of exclusion and participation that shape relationships and outcomes in school settings. Being a member of the school community researched, I have a stake in creating a "polyphonic" text that places the "voices of the anthropologist and subjects...in dialogue with each other and with historical material" (Ginsburg 1993: 175) in order to tease out the "common ground" between people supposedly diametrically opposed on an issue: I hope to contribute to dialogue that engenders a "weaving" of

perspectives on how policy processes can be used as sparks for action to address the complex needs that today's school community's have, instead of used as more grist for the mill of "othering" (Flores and Benmayor 1997:3, Rosaldo 1994: 252, Haraway 1988).

Conceptual Foundations: Cultural Citizenship

The idea of cultural citizenship has been championed by Latino scholars as a framework through which to understand the dynamism of highly complex communities, both large and small, in which people live today (Flores and Benmayor 1997:5). Flores and Benmayor and Benmayor explain that the usual theoretical concepts used in social sciences to understand social life in diverse settings, such as multiculturalism, assimilation and acculturation, "somehow [miss] the point of the dynamic processes taking place with Latino and other 'minoritized' communities" (9). Assimilation focuses too much on absorption and disappearance, while pluralism and multiculturalism assume a stable and unchanging country where immigrants simply add color and spice to the salad bowl but do not challenge traditional hegemonic views of "America" (10).

Flores and Benmayor argue that legal definitions of *citizenship* are also insufficient for deep understandings of current-day social dynamics. They "found the sociological and political notion of citizen as political subject a broader and more useful concept to describe the current realities of Latino communities. In this way, immigrants who might not be citizens in a legal sense or might not even be in this country legally, but who labor and contribute to the economic and cultural wealth of the country, would be recognized as legitimate political subjects claiming rights for themselves and their children, and in that sense as citizens" (11).

The idea of cultural citizenship, then, allows scholars to examine how a community defines itself, its interests and purpose, its binding solidarities, its boundaries, its membership and its voice (Flores and Benmayor 1997:13). It enables interrogation of the ways in which people understand and construct reality, how they interact with each other and how they negotiate their roles as they define "the distribution and allocation of

rights, privileges, and institutional access" (Rocco 1997: 98). It engenders understandings of today's ever-more diverse communities as complex, fluid "sites not only of contestation, but also of affirmation and cultural production" (9).

A key analytical process in explorations of cultural citizenship is unwrapping the "collective fictions" that communities construct about themselves and how they employ them to create a sense of belonging, entitlement, agency and dignity for their members, and to manage dynamics of negotiation, dispute and conflict (Rosaldo 1994: 243-244, Flores and Benmayor 1997:13). The lens of cultural citizenship asks how "cultural artifacts" look and feel from subject positions both dominant and subordinate in the community, to understand the "multiplicity of socio-material concerns" that people negotiate and the differential political and material outcomes that they experience (Rosaldo 1994: 244-245). Examining dynamics of cultural citizenship, then, requires more than just a focus on the micro--scholars must examine both the local *and* national contexts within which people live (Rosaldo 1994: 244-245). They must interrogate the distinct and overlapping contexts that shape how actors navigate between vernacular and national constructions of belonging and legitimacy; how they imagine and negotiate experience within structures of local and national participation (Rosaldo 1997:38, Flores and Benmayor 1997:15).

Scholars I draw on in my examination of bilingual education as a kind of "cultural artifact" in order to understand differential relationships within a local community and vis-à-vis an idealized national community are Anderson (1983), Smith and Heckman (1995); Ginsburg (1989); Handler (1988); Williams (1991), Urciuoli (1996), and Fordham (1996). Anderson looks at the way people "imagine" their relationship to a colonial center through print media. Handler looks at both government and regional discourses, and local cultural practices, to discuss the ways in which Quebecois and Canadian identities are imagined and employed in political struggle. Ginsburg and Urciuoli examine the multilayered semantics of key terms and discourses in Midwestern abortion debates and New York Puerto Rican daily life, respectively, and their implications for identity and agenda formations vis-à-vis an imagined American

community. Smith and Heckman interrogate the ways English, Spanish and bilingual education are used to draw boundaries of belonging and difference in a Southwest Mexican-American school community. Williams analyzes how cultural practices and discourses of ethnicity, religion and economics inform the ways actors in competing Guyanese communities shape their relationships to each other and economic opportunity, and to the nation and its development. Fordham looks at ideals of "success" from various perspectives in a Black community of Washington D.C. and how these perspectives shape identity, belonging and academic achievement.

Research on struggles for cultural citizenship is timely because political and social debates about the identity (cultural and phenotypic) and future of the U.S. have been raging as of late (see media chapters). Notions of what is "American" have been hotly debated in, for example, campaigns for nativist laws and policies that seek to eliminate affirmative action, to limit immigration and to restrict the rights of immigrants (debates about California's Propositions 187 and 209, the 1996 Federal Welfare Reform Act, the 1996 Immigration Reform Act, for example) (Flores and Benmayor 1997:3-4). Bilingual education has been an extremely controversial "cultural artifact" in recent debates about the definition of a properly educated American. Questions about what language/s are taught in school expose our feelings about immigration, race politics, the ideal of equality and fairness, and ultimately about what type of society we want to build (Ovando and McLaren 2000:xix, also Corson 1999, August and Hakuta 1997, Attinasi 1997, Crawford 1995, 1997, Smitherman 1992, Casanova 1991, Porter 1990, Fillmore 1992, Trujillo 1996, Fishman and Keller 1982).

I explore the politics of cultural citizenship as expressed through debates about bilingual education in two multiracial, multilingual contexts: locally, in a South Central Los Angeles school community and nationally, in widely circulating media-political discourses about bilingual education and related topics. I seek to understand how questions of language/s in school are less a single topic of contention and more a complex constellation of sites across which, "groups with distinct political, economic, and cultural visions" attempt to define what the socially legitimate means and ends of a

community and a society are to be, and whose knowledge is of most worth (McCarthy and Crichlow 1993). In her study of school restructuring in a southern city, Lipman (1998) found that because school community members failed to confront the fundamental issues of race and class that shaped life in their schools, the organizational reform efforts implemented with the hopes of improving student achievement for African-American and working-class students produced the same inequitable results that the reform was put in place to ameliorate. With Lipman (and critical multiculturalists and critical race theorists, amongst others), I believe that we must address basic struggles for cultural citizenship that spark, and then flow through, educational reform efforts. The difficult issues of what we believe about who belongs, who can learn and who can't, who should have a voice and what that means in practice, how we are interconnected, and what goals we have as communities must be brought to the table before the technical mandates of policy can actually improve schooling for *all* children.

I hope that this interrogation of the politics of bilingual, English Immersion, and English Only instructional policy will show why a drastic change in educational language policy that practically removed the (supposed) central issue of contention in a school community at war—the bilingual program--did not produce drastic changes in dynamics between Latino, African-American and white school community members. Even with our best intentions to find an approach to these policies that would end conflict and improve the educational environment on campus, relationships and outcomes suffered after Proposition 227 as they did before Proposition 227. I will attempt to show here that a major reason for this was the fact that through it all we did not address in any fundamental way as a community the question of, "Who *are WE*, and what does this say about us?"

Theoretical Foundations

Hegemony, Resistance and Cultural Production

The theoretical frameworks of hegemony and cultural production are helpful in understanding the ways in which actors experience and shape relationships and access to cultural citizenship in both macro and micro contexts. Stuart Hall (1988) argues that in social contestations over power and ideological hegemony (understood in Gramscian terms), a certain dominant framework comes to gain popularity. People on all sides of the struggle accord this framework of assumptions and sets of discourses the "symbolic power to map or classify the world" (44). Hence, when an issue is debated and a struggle waged, it is that "circle of dominant ideas" that poses the questions around which the conflict rages (54).

I follow in the footsteps of post-Marxist, critical cultural studies in interrogating the ways in which people connect to and resist these dominant ideas to claim cultural citizenship through debates about bilingual education. Gilroy (1987) points out that it is not so simple an analytical endeavor: positions vis-à-vis this circle of dominant ideas are often more complex than a dichotomy between those of the powerful and the powerless, between the hegemonic and the counterhegemonic, and between "local" and "national" issues. The positions and agendas of actors on opposing sides of a struggle often manifest logics that duplicate as well as counter each other. Underlying assumptions of both are variously employed in discourses of actors on both "sides" (Gilroy 1987: 40, 64). Why? Hall (1988) reminds us that social collectivities in struggles often have more than one set of agendas: They "have both the interest of advancing and improving their position" within a certain arena, "and of not losing their place" within another (45). As such, actors often assume "a number of specific subject positions" in relation to the issues at hand (49). These positions can be contradictory or even mutually exclusive.

As such, Gilroy (1987) addresses the importance of interrogating the social processes of delineating "sides" in struggle and of defending their borders through the use of charged discourses and symbols. He asserts that in struggle, while lines may be drawn

discursively in very definitive ways, subjects are not unitary or essential but part of loosely assembled "interpretive communities" (235). Interpretive communities are collectivities whose members share sets of experiences, perceptions, forms of expression, and goals in a struggle. They share similar points of location within and against hegemonic ideological and material formations.

This is similar to Bourdieu's concept of class: In Language and Symbolic Power (1991) Bourdieu defines "classes" not in terms of relationships to the means of production in Marxist terms, but as "sets of agents who occupy similar positions in the social space, and hence possess similar kinds and similar quantities of capital, similar life chances, similar dispositions, etc." (Thompson 1991: 30). Classes come together under a shared vision of the social world and of themselves as having a particular place within that world. As feminist standpoint epistemology would argue, it depends on "where you stand" at any one time in relation to each other and to structures of domination how much power you have to leverage (or think you have, or think another has), or the extent to which you ally with the dominant at any particular moment (hooks 2000). I value Bourdieu's idea of classes and Gilroy's idea of interpretive communities because while I do not fancy this dissertation to be an exploration of *class politics* in a strictly technical or economic sense I do see South Central Elementary school community members' struggles for cultural citizenship to constitute attempts to secure better "positions in the social space"--the moral, professional, institutional, communal, and material spaces--on campus, in the city and in America.

Gilroy states that membership in interpretive communities is constantly (re)articulated according to relations to different systems of power and the shared use of a “multi-accented symbolic repertoire”(235). To understand how within an interpretive community there can co-exist many axes of concordance and divergence (how political agendas can be complex and sometimes internally contradictory), and the implications of this in practice, we must take a look at the pragmatics of a community's symbolic repertoire. What are the salient, charged discourses and symbols, what are their contradictory and shifting logics? How do they manifest in particular argumentative

structures, and how do they change with context? What determines their inner fractures, their lines of articulation (Gilroy 1987: 56)? Following Gramsci (1971:324), Hall (1988) and Bakhtin (1991), I also ask these questions across interpretive communities that are in conflict--how are key discourses across (supposedly) distinct interpretive communities and "levels" of society multi-accentual, polyvocal, co-constructed? What implications does this have for differently-placed actors and their agendas in the political terrain?

Levinson and Holland's (1996) concept of "cultural production" brings these dynamics and questions to bear on educational contexts. They define cultural production as, "a continual process of creating meaning in social and material contexts" (13), that often plays into struggles for hegemony in other, and larger, arenas. Schools cannot be looked at as sites of seamless cultural transmission, such as in much social reproduction and cultural transmission theory (5; for example Bowles and Gintis 1976; Bourdieu and Passeron 1977; Henry 1963; Spindler 1982; Wilcox 1982). And yet neither are schools arenas of unimpinged agency and production of social relations. Actors function, Levinson and Holland argue, within "the interplay of agency and structure" (3). As public institutions, schools are squarely situated between the local and the national (1). Actors function within parameters shaped by local contingencies *and* by wider trends and nationally imposed agendas. They negotiate differential resources for, and constraints upon, social interaction (3, and see Foley 1990 and 1995, Willis 1977, MacLeod 1987, Fordham 1996, Luykx 1999, Oakes 1985, Spindler 1982).

Levinson and Holland (1996) also assert that within these multiple parameters the supposedly essential categories, discourses and symbols deployed in struggle (for example racial identities, linguistic pedagogies, the idea of "America," etc.) are actually open political categories (11). Rather than static givens, the contours and content of these categories and key terms are negotiated "in struggle" (11; see also Handler 1988, Foley, N. 1997, Dominguez 1986, Horton 1995, Hall 1996). Scholars of cultural production seek to understand the ways in which these categories, discourses and symbols are constructed vis-à-vis local and national parameters, and how they function in shaping educational contexts, relationships and outcomes. Such inquiries can engage the multiple,

contradictory, and complex subject positions people occupy within different social, cultural and economic locations (Giroux 1993). Armed with understandings of these, actors can engender a new political imaginary, a counterhegemonic politics based in diversity and complexity rather than uniformity and bipolarity.

The Anthropology of Policy

Shore and Wright (1997) contend that, "Policy has become an increasingly central concept in the organization of contemporary societies" (4). Through policy, individuals and communities are "categorized" and given particular statuses and roles in different social, political, and power contexts. "The study of policy, therefore, leads straight into issues at the heart of anthropology: norms and institutions; ideology and consciousness; knowledge and power; rhetoric and discourse; meaning and interpretations; the global and the local--to mention but a few" (4). Indeed, they argue, "to use Mauss's concept [1954], policies can be studied as 'total social phenomenon' as they have important economic, legal, cultural and moral implications, and can create whole [sets] of relationships between individuals, groups and objects" (7).

And yet policy has, "scarcely been analyzed or theorized by anthropologists" as a complex, contested, cultural phenomenon, a "contested cultural resource" (6) in community life. It has continued to be underexplored, viewed simply as an instrumentalist, top-down governing tool. A new anthropology of policy examines policies as multi-accentuated, symbolic phenomenon (“cultural artifacts”) articulated across the social terrain. It asks, whose voices prevail in the implementation of, and struggles over, policies; how; why; and with what affects in particular situations? How and why are certain discourses around policy made authoritative at certain historical junctures (15)? To answer these questions, Shore and Wright affirm the need for anthropologists to "study through" the multiple meanings and sites of policy, in micro and macro arenas (14).

This is particularly salient for research on certain policies in California. The state's ballot initiative process allows for any member of the public who can amass

enough monetary and political support to propose and campaign for a policy initiative of their choice. If certain minimal requirements are met such as a particular number of signatures collected in support of an initiative, it is then placed on the ballot in state elections and if it passes it becomes law. Many controversial social and educational policies such as Propositions 187, 209 and my topic here, 227, were instituted through this ballot initiative process. As such, these policy initiatives exemplify and involve true civil societal discourse and power struggle. And Corson (1999) reminds us that in education in particular, practitioners are "applied language planners" (6): School community members take policy mandates from without, policy hopes and agendas from within, practical dictates of daily life in the community and decide, "How are we going to do what we hope to do" (6)?

As I attempt to show here, how the shift from bilingual education to English Immersion policy was actually implemented, experienced and talked about through discourses of race, immigration, language, and nation are windows into dynamics of dis/connection, re/articulation, power, and community. It is my hope that if we look through these windows long enough and critically enough we can find paths towards dialogue, the cultivation of shared meanings and coalitional avenues towards shared cultural citizenship.

Language

Bourdieu and Passeron state that one cannot talk about a language without also talking about a set of relations to that language (1977: 116; also Fishman 1976). In my exploration of the politics of cultural citizenship as waged on the terrain of debates about bilingual education, I work from this assumption, exploring how issues of language and language policy are hardly ever "about language as such but about what kind of political community we are and wish to be" (Schmidt 2000: 183). Looking at the "political economy of language" (Urciuoli 1996: 4), I track the pragmatics of how people construct the meaning and value of languages as a kind of index of power relations: "bureaucratic,

economic, racial, and any combination thereof " (Gal 1987: 4, also Irvine 1989, Gal 1989).

To explore this, I draw on works from critical linguistic anthropology to ask how discourses and metadiscursive commentary about language, language competencies, and language policy shape and reflect school community members' relations to dynamics of cultural citizenship in local and national contexts (Gal 1994 and 1989; Woolard 1989; Urciuoli 1996, Hill and Irvine 1992 ; also Bourdieu 1991; Arteaga 1996). I ask how the rhetorical "place markers" (McCarthy and Crichlow1993: viii; see also Roediger 1991, Gal 1994; Hall 1988) and "key symbols" (Woolard 1989: 8) or "keywords" (Williams 1976) like "America," "immigrant," "EO," " Spanish," "227" and "bilingual" function: Locally, I examine the pragmatics of these key symbols, and how talk about them becomes what Bourdieu (1991) calls, “performative” utterances (128): speakers' attempts “to produce and impose representations of the social world” in order to circumscribe the actions they themselves and others can “undertake to transform the social world in accordance with their interests”(128). How do these performative utterances co-construct each other and how do they become "metacommunicative" (Urciuoli 1996), signaling a whole set of assumptions and agendas in struggle?

This follows the work of scholars who look at the multifaceted, fluid political content that these categories/discourses/symbols carry in *and through* schools and societies (for example Zentella 1990; Woolard 1989; Smith and Heckman 1995; Heller 1995). An example of such work in a neighboring community to South Central Los Angeles is Horton's (1995) study of the politics of immigration and change in Monterey Park, California in the 1990s. He found that a key metacommunicative discourse, that of "newcomers vs. established residents," was extremely fluid and became increasingly complex over time (8). Who fell into the categories of "newcomer" and "established resident"--and the very import of these identities--shifted over time according to immigration flows, coalition building, electoral outcomes, and dynamics of assimilation and resistance. If we leave unexplored the complex nature of such categories and the multiple roles they play in shaping relationships to policy and practice, we are left with

partial, fragmented views of the dynamics that impact lives in diverse school communities (McCarthy and Crichlow 1993).

As such I seek to displace assumptions made in much educational research about the essential, discrete nature of the linguistic, political and identity categories employed in struggle ("Black," "Latino," "Spanish," "English," "America," etc.) (Yon 2000). I look at how language categories and identities can be context-dependent and ambiguous, showing how the code itself, here Spanish or English, does not have an essential meaning--it is within the "specific relations and contexts" in which it is spoken and negotiated that it gains its meaning and value (Urciuoli 1996: 51). In this case I show how language often signifies race and vice versa (English standing in for African-American and Spanish for Latino--the two identity/political categories become *co-constitutive*). I watch how language becomes "an important dimension of racial 'subject-ification'" and vice versa (Ong 1996, cited in Harrison 1998: 620).

As my study is longitudinal, looking at talk about language in a community and nation undergoing drastic demographic and policy changes, I take particular heed of Roediger's (1991) assertion (after Bakhtin) that a "change in signifiers itself" can signal "a new set of social realities and racial [and material...] meanings" (15). Semantic shifts or shifts in the pragmatics of a key discourse or symbol can leave "fingerprints for tracing more profound transformations" in human relations (Shore and Wright 1997: 19). So, too, I will argue, pronounced fingerprints are left by a *stability* in politically-charged discourses and symbols amidst radical, chaotic programmatic change.

This also address what is sometimes a shortcoming in anthropological research about language. As Duranti (1994) notes, scholars have produced innumerable fine-grained analyses of speech acts (Searle 1972) and ethnographies of speaking (Hymes 1972; Gumperz and Hymes 1972; Heath 1983), examining the ways in which the intricacies of speech shape/are shaped by daily life, genre conventions and belief systems. However, much more critique of the wider-scale systems of domination, power politics and economics that these local practices exist within is needed. Further, ethnographies of education have also overwhelmingly focused on the microlevel (Luykx1999:xxxiv),

looking at language issues only in the classroom or school community level. In all this study of language there has been relatively little exploration beyond the local or beyond dichotomies (national/local, mainstream/subaltern, black/white) (Walker 1987: 32).

Attinasi (1997) argues that investigating through dichotomies and critiquing systems of domination and exclusion helps take scholars from the *study* of language to *contributing to* the politics of language--to countering what he calls "the linguistics of racism"(281). He points out that a "communicative apartheid"(286) exists in the U.S., playing off hegemonic, dichotomous views of correct and incorrect language use, shutting out not just one group or another from structures of power but "all groups who do not share the language of power" (294, 279-280). An important example, he states, is the English Only movement, which can be seen to portend a "negative impact on Black students" as much as for Latinos/Spanish speakers (292; see also Smitherman 2002 and 1992). Attinasi's suggested strategy of resistance to hegemonic constructions of acceptable language competencies is for *all* students to expand their linguistic repertoires by learning a range of languages and communication styles.

This is a long-needed departure from common sense constructions of the issue of bilingual education in the US. In mainstream research and political/media treatment of the issue, bilingual education is overwhelmingly characterized as a "Latino issue." While the existence of bilingual programs in other languages is sometimes acknowledged (Mandarin, Cantonese, Armenian, Farsi, Hmong, Korean and Vietnamese in the LAUSD to name a few), most attention is paid to programs for Latino Spanish-speaking students (e.g. Keller and VanHooft 1982; García, O. 1991; Padilla 1979; Baker 1993; Colvin 1996; Cooper, M. 1994; Cuadrado 1993; Dusheck 1995; Heritage Foundation 1994; Loar 1995; McDonnell 1996; Phinney and Reza 1996; Pyle1995,1996; Savage 1996; Sengupta 1994; Sowell 1991; Touchman 1996; Velásquez 1995; Yardley 1994; Zachmanoglou 1994; 20/20 1996). This trend is so extreme that August and Hakuta (1997) report a need for research on even "the most basic" aspects of how bilingual education affects communities and students "with native languages other than Spanish" (7). By looking at how issues of language affect Latino, Black, and white school community members,

native Spanish and native English speakers, this project provides some of that "basic" information.

Race

In looking at racial dynamics in struggles for cultural citizenship, my understanding of race is based in Omi and Winant's (1994) definition: Race is, "a concept which signifies and symbolizes social conflicts and interests by referring to different types of human bodies" (55). Like DuBois (1940) and Visweswaran (1998) I believe that these "types of human bodies" should be understood not as biological entities but as social constructions shaped by shared sets of historical experiences and complex sites of struggle (like interpretive communities). I draw on the fundamental assertion of critical race theory, that racial difference and white supremacy are organizing principles of American society, underlying such basic concepts as citizenship, property rights and equality (Bell 1997a, 1997b; Crenshaw1995; Delgado and Stefanic 1995; Harris 1995; López 1995; Peller 1995;Flagg 1997a and 1997b, Goldberg 1996; hooks 1992). These racial principles pervade the politics of culture, difference, class, identity, education and immigration, to name a few (Gilroy 1987; West 1994, 1990; Gregory and Sanjek 1994; Hall 1980, 1988, 1996; Balibar 1991; Williams 1989; Almaguer 1994; Giroux 1993, Roediger 1991, Hartigan 1999).

McCarthy and Crichlow (1993) point to a persisting "crisis in the theorization of race and racial logics in education" (xiv). Questions of race, they argue, threaten hitherto unchallenged methodological and ethical assumptions about the privileging of established agendas in research and practice (xvii). Just addressing questions of race in a critical way, then, my work contributes to an important, growing body of critical race theory in the anthropology of education (e.g. Delpit and Dowdy 2002, Apple 1996, 1993; Ladson-Billings 1998; Ogbu and Mutute-Bianchi 1996; Foley 1990; Fordham 1996; Fine et al. 1997; Fine et al. (eds.); Giroux 1997; Barrera 1997; MacLeod 1987; Oakes 1985).

Most of the literature on race and education in the U.S. shows a tendency to focus on African-Americans or on a bipolar Black/white framework (Flores and Benmayor

1997). Given this Black/white dichotomy, Latinos--now the largest "minority" group in the U.S.--and other groups are often left out of discussions, leaving unexamined the "different ways policy and actions affect different groups and sub-groups" (Attinasi 1997; see also Seller and Weis 1997). When Latinos are discussed (Foley 1990; Menchaca 1993, 1995; Trujillo 1996; Barrera 1997) it is usually an exploration of Latino/white relations. Weis (1996) confirms that in educational literature, "there has been excellent research on various groups as they struggle for emotional, intellectual, cultural and economic space," but "we have not spent enough time focusing on the ways in which these groups struggle in relation to each other"(x).

Additionally, in the burgeoning body of literature on race and whiteness, much has been written to expose and critique white people's spaces of privilege (e.g. Harris 1995; Peller 1995; Morrison 1992; MacCannel 1992; Foley 1990; Hartigan 1997 and 1999; Frankenberg 1993; Fine 1997). This is important work. And at the same time, in it I find a tendency that can limit understandings of the complex nature of race: Whiteness is essentialized, placed simply in opposition to a "racialized other" and conceptualized as *only* a subject position/structure of privilege for a taken-for-granted construction of phenotypically white people (Frankenberg 1993 ; Hartigan 1997; Sleeter 1993; Fine 1997; Roman 1993). This can be dangerous, as it overlooks how race/whiteness is, in important ways, "a relentlessly local matter," produced and experienced distinctly depending on location (Hartigan 1999: 14). This holds for other racial and sociopolitical categories as well. Dominguez (1986), for example, discusses the ways in which terms like "black," "mulatto," "Indian," and "white" have historically been variously inhabited and manipulated in social and economic struggles in Louisiana. I follow the work of scholars like MacCannell (1992), Fanon (1967), Winddance Twine (1997), Fine et. al. (1997), Frankenberg (1993), Segal (1993), Hartigan (1999), and Strong (1992), asking how the category of whiteness manifests as shifting sets of practices, forms of property, performances, shifting locations of privilege/subordination, polyvocal, political symbols (Ellsworth 1997: 264)--and to what ends and for whom.

Further, as the principal at South Central Elementary said to me once, what made it challenging to address issues of conflict and inequality on our campus was the fact that, "Here, language *is* race." With this in mind I explore how racial and language categories and discourses function both *in and between each other* (drawing on Ellsworth 1997, Fordham 1996; Frankenberg 1997; Harris 1995; Winddance Twine 1997, Dominguez 1986, Foley, N. 1997) *and (as mentioned in the Language section) how they co-construct with other* politically-charged political categories such as immigrant, nation and the proper knowledge for educators. I ask, for example, how "African-American" is used interchangeably with "English Only" and tied to particular constructions of "America" in moves to legitimize a policy agenda or sets of professional knowledge or to stake a claim to cultural citizenship. What kinds of work do these articulations of categories and this fluidity within categories do in shaping specific agendas and material and social outcomes?

Action, Homework

In Gupta and Ferguson's (1998) words, going to the "field" in anthropology has traditionally meant a trip to a place that is far away and "wild" (8). It has been assumed that only by going to some "Other" place (8) can an anthropologist find the difference and distance necessary for analytical clarity. The assumed and constructed distance and omnipotence of the ethnographer started bending to critique as early as the late 1940s and 1950s, when anthropologists began to explore the "field" as a place to research and to *act*--Tax and his students advocated an "action anthropology" that united ethnographic work with the provision of social programs, in order to produce better anthropological theory as it solved pressing problems in the community researched (Foley 1999: 171). While anticipating to a degree later feminist, postmodern and activist critiques of anthropology (172), this first attempt at politicizing research can be critiqued (for problems still evident in much of anthropology and the anthropology of education): It usually meant white middle-class anthropologists going to "Other" communities and "helping them" (Gupta and Ferguson 1998; Scheper-Hughes 1995).

Work in feminist, post-colonial, native and auto-ethnography has taken on this problem, asserting that the insider's perspective on data and political involvement in the field generate unique, powerful analytical insights and enrich the ethnographic project (e.g. Reed-Danahay 1997, Abu-Lughod 1991, Behar 1993, Weston 1998, Kondo 1990). Inspired by these scholars and by Foley (1990, Menchaca (1995), Benmayor (1991), and Ginsburg (1989), I have gone to investigate a community from which I "come"/that I am deeply invested in. I consider myself to be a, activist version of what Abu-Lughod (1991) calls a "halfie" anthropologist, or what Weston (1998) calls the "virtual anthropologist": an anthropologist who is also a member of the community they study. South Central Elementary is a place where I have worked and grown as a professional over the past 11 years; indeed it is where I have forged the very core of my identity as an adult. When people ask me “What do you do?” The first thing out of my mouth is always, “I’m a teacher.” I fill in information about anthropology, educational consulting, and other stuff later. I have made some of my closest friends at South Central; it’s where I have taught, loved and been involved in the lives of children and their families. It is the place that inspired this project and a place that I hope to affect in a positive way with what I learned through this project.

As a school community member myself (again) during the 1998-2000 research, I ran the risk of being talked about in, and affected by, this research as much as other school community members. I asked and answered questions from shifting positions (Haraway 1988), sometimes as anthropologist, sometimes as teacher, sometimes as white person, sometimes as "Latino/bilingual " advocate, sometimes as "African-American/EO" advocate. This evokes Haraway's (1988) idea of the anthropologist's split and contradictory self, and Ginsburg's (1989:X) concept of "shifting internal tectonics." Somewhere *between* anthropologist and "informant," I negotiated less the traditional anthropological idea of rapport and more that of complicity (Marcus 1998, Agar 1996: 137). This project was "homework" for me as much as it was "fieldwork" (Gordon 1998:viii, citing Visweswaran 1994).

My project was also based in Atweh, Kemmis and Wilkinson's idea of Participatory Action Research--investigating reality in order to change it and changing reality in order to investigate it (1998: 21, drawing on Fals Borda 1979). Similar to Freire's idea of conscientização (1973), PAR requires that people do research "on themselves" (23). In collaborative forums participants explore and critique their knowledge, interpretive categories, communication and experiences. They strive to understand the ways in which these are shaped by social structures, discourses and power in and across the dimensions of subjective/individual/local/micro and objective/social/macro (23, 25); when these connections are understood dynamically people are poised to improve their realities (32-33).

In the Activist Anthropology chapter I describe my and others' efforts to establish Professional Discussion Groups at South Central Elementary. We sought to create a forum where teachers and eventually all other school community members could address concerns about conflict over bilingual education and Prop 227, about intergroup relations on campus, about teacher practice, and about how all of these concerns shaped our roles as political subjects in a wider sense. We hoped to use this forum as a springboard for educational and political projects that would counter hegemonic assumptions about what language(s) are appropriate for whom and why, that would challenge hegemonic relations of inequality based on difference (Haraway 1988: 192), and that would empower all in our school community to enjoy cultural citizenship. The idea for Professional Discussion Groups also drew on work about the teacher as researcher (Hitchcock and Hughes 1995, Hale Hankins 1997, Ulichny and Schoener 1996; Gitlin and Russell 1994); Action Research (McLean 1995; Livingston and Castle 1989; Bullough, Jr. and Gitlin 1995), and Educative Research (Gitlin and Russell 1994). This literature advocates that teachers investigate teaching to learn how to "shape and reshape" their practice so as to better serve their students.

Professional Discussion Group and the other projects I engaged in on campus that I mentioned earlier (the tutoring project, the Standards-Based Assessment Coordinator position, etc.), were only one manifestation of the activist approach that I

undertook. More *fundamentally*, I consider this project to be "activist" because the research questions I pose here, the very reason for the research, are based in concerns that people across the school community--not just me--wanted to address. Very often during my research in 1996 people punctuated their descriptions of the "war" with statements like, "We need to address this issue. We need to talk about this. We have to face what is going on here." I so strongly agreed that I set out in the 1998-2000 period of research to do just that--to talk with people and to engage people with each other around the dynamics of conflict and its implications for all of our futures, in the hopes of moving us towards paths of conflict resolution and community improvement. Being a teacher there both before and during the research afforded me the positionality of someone who "was a part of" the very questions that I asked people. For example during interviews there were sometimes nods or other gestures to indicate particular individuals or opinions within a speaker's discussion of an issue; only an insider would know to whom or what these gestures referenced. Hence, particularly sensitive things could be said in relative comfort--they could be said without saying them. Or, people would engage with me directly about my classroom or my experience as they discussed theirs. The interview could then be made more give-and-take. People could speak with me as someone who understood the context within which they answered my questions. I believe this gave me access to detailed and sensitive information that otherwise might not have surfaced, leading to a deeper understanding of the issues and better information to engage in efforts to move us towards paths of resolution of conflict and improvement of the school community. And the whole Professional Discussion Group project was so supported (by those who supported it, anyway) I believe because first, people trusted me as a facilitator of such a group because I was just as implicated in what would be discussed as anyone else (I was not some disconnected outsider coming to coldly watch them deal with their conflict as fodder for my personal gain); and second, because key people who had to approve the project (like the principal) trusted my skills as a facilitator and professional development provider, and trusted the sincerity of my intentions to use the Group as a

forum for improvement of the school community based on their long-term personal and professional relationships with me.

Hence the activist approach that I brought to this work transformed the anthropological enterprise itself. Not a typical anthropologist going to observe an "other," the very ways in which I engaged people, the very ways in which people saw/imagined me and interacted with me, the ways in which I conceptualized my questions and the uses of data, and the various things I *did* in the research setting--my methodology-- were determined by the fact that my research was homework more than fieldwork.

In 1996, when I first returned to campus after having left teaching in 1994, I teared up with memories of the challenges and good times I had had there, and of my students (how I missed them!). I knew I would be happy to be back, but I was surprised to feel uneasy walking into the office. I thought, should I walk right in to say hi as I always used to do, or should I stop at the desk and ask for a VISITOR identification sticker? Visitor? Would people accept me again and be open to my anthropologists gaze? After hugs and welcomes, I did feel at home again, but I also took a VISITOR sticker. After wearing it on my chest for three days I put it on the cover of my field notebook, which was a constant reminder of what was going on: The notebook was filling up with all of my questions and "their" answers.

As I began my research I wondered--and even having been a *teacher*-researcher in 1998-2000, upon writing this in 2003 I still wonder--Can I successfully “braid” my “insider” personal perspectives with my “outsider” anthropological agenda (Fordham 1996:15)? I felt that the two were plaited, inseparable, but would this play out in my actions, interactions and scholarly productions? Could I weave these into work on campus, and then into a text that sparks dialogue and deepens understandings of educational and political life, and that contributes to making both better for all of us?

Multicultural Education

A general impetus for my research comes from the basic critique and ideals of multicultural education. This movement calls attention to the cultural contexts and power relations that inform life in diverse schools and communities (e.g. Banks 1988, Lee 1996, Olson n.d., Cazden and Dickinson 1981, Cheng 1987, August and Pease-Alvarez 1997, Brunson Phillips 1988, Hidalgo 1993, Walqui 1992, Phelan and Davidson 1993, Kagan and Kagan 1998, Trueba 1987, Pumfrey 1989, Perry and Delpit 1998, Garcia 1991, Gilmore 1991). My work aligns closely with scholarship in critical multicultural education, or what Sleeter and Grant call "multicultural social reconstructionist education" (1994, Sleeter 1996). This work pushes the analysis of race, class, gender and other political dynamics in order to expose how cultural production is organized within unequal relations of power in schools, and to enliven struggles to make schools empowering democratic spheres (e.g. McCarthy and Crichlow 1993, hooks 1994b, Delpit 1993, 1995, Delpit and Kilgour Dowdy 2002, Apple 1993, Fine et al. 1997, Darder, Torres and Gutierrez 1997, Ladson-Billings 1994, 1998).

I diverge a bit from some of this work, however. Sleeter (1996) states that the "natural constituency" of multiculturalism as a social movement is oppressed peoples of color, low-income communities, gays, lesbians and girls (231). White educators and researchers should become "allies," "sharing power" with "them" and furnishing "them" resources (134). I do not think it is *just* these circumscribed groups that benefit from (and need help with) critical multiculturalist agendas. Such talk about being allies of the oppressed seems to continue the practice of objectifying the Other, making the Others' educations and social struggles just that--Other (Yeo 1997: 136). Now, while phenotypically white people certainly benefit disproportionately from institutionalized systems of privilege (that cannot be understated), I see privilege and struggles for privilege as less dichotomous than that. As I attempt to show in the case of South Central Elementary, actors *white, Black and Brown* employed discourses that are usually stereotyped as "white" and benefited or attempted to benefit from assumptions and

patterns of exclusion that have historically been to the most benefit of white people. And people of *white and all other backgrounds* in whatever community nationwide, will benefit from *all* young people in America today becoming well-educated and productive in complex, global ethnoscapes (Hochschild and Scovronick 2003, Smitherman 2002). If we assume that the phenotypically "other" is Other, that our lives and struggles are discrete and simply oppositional, and that we all don't need *each other* as allies, we miss Bhabba's insight that "boundaries" are not "the end of things" but "where things begin their presencing" (1994:1)-- and we miss an opportunity to collaboratively create deep, meaningful, systemic change.

Methodological Foundations

Multi-sited and critical ethnography

Drawing on the work of George Marcus (1998), this dissertation narrates the long-term, multi-sited ethnographic research I conducted at South Central Elementary and in widely-circulating media discourses, about struggles for cultural citizenship as fought through bilingual education politics and policy. Marcus proposes that a multi-sited ethnography rejects anthropology's traditional local/place-focused approach and instead adopts a *places*-focused strategy (50). These places are sites or levels of analysis (such as "global/local") that are often seen as only loosely related or even incommensurate. The ethnographer "follows the conflict" (94), tracing and mapping the connections and divergences between its manifestations within different fields of unequal power relation and examining the ways in which each locale makes a "critical commentary upon the other" (Marcus 1998: 52; see also(Gupta and Ferguson 1997: 35). This can enrich our understanding of how social categories, cultural practices and relations of power function in society and change.

Similar to Ginsburg's (1989) project on the abortion debate, Hale's (1994) discussion of Indígena identity politics in the Americas, and Foley's (1990) exploration of

South Texas ethnic/race politics, a multi-sited approach for me involves juxtaposing the often-thought distinct arenas of political and media discourses with the details of everyday experience and talk (Marcus 1998: 73). Locally, I explore how variously-positioned actors in a South Central Los Angeles school community imagined, employed and challenged widely-circulating social discourses of race, language , immigration, Americanness and belonging through their negotiations of shifting bilingual education policy and practice pre- and post- Proposition 227. Nationally, I conducted research at the site of media discourses about these issues, analyzing newspaper, television and radio discourses. As mentioned, I sought out articulations and divergences between these "mediascapes" (Appadurai 1991: 6-7) and local narratives. I asked how each set of discourses related to the other in shaping subject positions, agendas, and educational and material outcomes.

This addresses a weakness that Walker (1987) identifies in mainstream research on bilingual education. Walker identifies two traditional approaches: Either sweeping accounts of the history and politics surrounding the issue (the “macro” approach), or detailed experimental and ethnographic work in actual bilingual programs (the “micro” approach). However, she states, “So complex are the questions that need to be asked and the issues that need resolution,” that only a “mosaic method” that threads together a micro and macro approach--a multisited ethnography--will begin to reveal a complete picture (32) of the content and implications of bilingual education politics.

All this builds upon a growing tradition of critical ethnography in anthropology and the anthropology of education (Marcus and Fischer 1986, Gordon 1998, Foley 1990, 1995, Carspecken and Apple 1992; Gilroy 1987, Luykx 1999, Williams 1991; Willis 1977, MacLeod 1987, Fordham 1996). Critical ethnographies address the ways in which cultural practices inform political and power structures and dynamics of inequality in society, usually with the goal of contributing to efforts to combat such inequities (Agar 1996: 26, Quantz 1992: 467). It also stems from a body of literature in education with names such as critical pedagogy, liberatory pedagogy, and border pedagogy. Exemplified in the work of Freire (1972), Giroux (1991, 1992a, 1993), and bell hooks

(1989, 1992, 1994a, b), these scholars engage the multiple, complex positions people and discourses occupy in diverse locations , reterritorializing hegemonic configurations of social categories, knowledge and power (Giroux 1992a). Critical educational ethnographies seek to engender a new political imaginary, a counterhegemonic politics based in possibility, diversity and complexity rather than uniformity and bipolarity.

Multiple Sites and Data Sources

To follow the conflict I had to follow the talk. I had to follow the discourses and discursive categories that people used, inhabited, and contested. I had to follow the discursive trail across two sites, the local and the national; across time, from 1996 through 2000; and through two realms, the personal and political... and back again. My formal research periods in the summer of 1996 and from 1998-2000 were augmented by my informal data gathering and reflection during my teaching experience as far back as 1991 and my sporadic monitoring of media discourses in the interim between and after formal research periods. In both 1996 and 1998, my first week on campus I introduced my project to the entire faculty and staff at an after-school meeting. I told them that I would be occasionally seen taking notes around campus and that I would be interviewing people, volunteers, during breaks and after hours. I introduced my project to parents and others in the school community on an ongoing basis as I interacted with them.

At the local site, I used the ethnographic research techniques of participant observation, interviews and document collection. In 1996 my participant observation involved the usual sitting in on meetings, chatting at lunch and in the hallways, and just being around to experience things. In 1998-2000 participant observation was much more intense, as I was truly a "participant." My field notes collecting process had to be tailored to this research situation (Agar 1996: 162; Sanjek 1990: 386). I kept tape recorders and note pads in various locations at all times to record observations and thoughts on the run. I also used the auto-ethnographic technique of maintaining a critical reflections journal on my own experiences as a school community member.

My interviews with teachers, staff members, administrators, district personnel and parents were sometimes formal, sometimes informal, in classrooms, in the faculty lounge, in the library and in other locations such as at restaurants over lunch. In all I conducted over 100 interviews. I also sought out casual conversations with people in hallways, during breaks, on the playground, and at social gatherings. These conversations were countless. Regardless, I interacted with people around a list of a few basic questions and an accompanying "repertoire of question-asking strategies from which to draw as the moment [seemed] appropriate" (Agar 1996: 140).

I used two sampling techniques to attain interviews and informative conversations. The first was opportunistic sampling (Agar 1996: 168), observing and talking with any school community members available and willing. The second was judgment, or theoretical, sampling (Agar 1996: 168; Glaser and Strauss 1967: 47), targeting specific people who, based on on-going analysis of data I was collecting, I expected to provide particularly rich or comparative data. I also observed two School Board meetings and acquired recordings of others.

As for the collection of documents I saved regular faculty meeting agendas, weekly staff bulletins, select (publicly distributed) school-home communication documents, school employee and classroom identification rosters, district-wide pamphlets and notices, and certain (publicly available) documentation about our student population.

Finally, I used the Participatory Action Research framework to establish Professional Discussion Groups: As I discuss in the Action Anthropology chapter, the PDG was intended as a forum for school community exploration, dialogue and problem solving around critical issues that arose in my research as well as other salient issues in teaching and learning. I organized facilitated and took notes at these meetings. The Participatory Action aspect of my project also involved other duties and endeavors such as the tutoring program I mentioned earlier. I discuss these in more detail in the Action Anthropology chapter.

At the national level I looked at the coverage in the media about bilingual education, race, etc. as what Appadurai (1991) calls "mediascapes": the historically

situated discourses and images that flow through society and that local actors draw upon and challenge to "imagine" to their world and construct it through narrative (6-7). I followed the mass political and media discourses in newspapers, TV and radio, in educational publications and in books. Newspapers I followed were The Los Angeles Times, La Opinión (Los Angeles Spanish language newspaper), and The New York Times. In 1996 I clipped from these sources regularly and also researched media discourses going back several years. In 1998-2000 I poured over all three of these newspapers daily. I tuned in to English and Spanish-language news and radio programs during both research periods on a regular basis. The professional publications I followed most closely were the local teachers union newspaper and national publications from organizations like the National Education Association and National Association for Bilingual Education. I also read a few books on the topic that were marketed to "mainstream" audiences (e.g., Porter, 1990).

When clipping or recording from these sources I sifted for politically and symbolically charged discourses about race politics and affirmative action; language politics, the English Only movement, bilingual education and Proposition 227; debates about immigration policy and its effects; demographic and cultural shifts in the U.S., especially the touted "new Latino face" of America; general educational issues; and the range of topics that received attention relating to the Los Angeles Unified School District.

Data Analysis

During both research periods I began data analysis soon after I began data collection. I used informal, on-going data analysis as a tool to help me make sense of what I was seeing and hearing and to help me tailor my observations and questions as I went along (Glaser and Strauss 1967).

To analyze most of my local data I did what Sanjek (1990: 386) calls indexing: selecting themes to search for in the data, while also searching for emerging themes, or categories (Glaser and Strauss 1967: 37). After conducting enough analysis of my data to feel confident in the categories identified, I reviewed the data in light of these themes to

code it and conduct content analysis of it (Agar 1996: 158; Glaser and Strauss 1967; Carspecken and Apple 1992). Additionally, I conducted a textual analysis of the documents I collected, asking in what ways the information found there contextualized, confirmed or challenged school committee members' accounts of events or my understandings of the data.

I also used techniques of discourse analysis. I looked at the ways people organized their accounts of events, their explanations of opinions, and their answers to questions. Following scholars like Foley (1990, 1995), Heath (1983), Hartigan (1999), Urciuoli (1996), and others, I asked, What is the macro structure of the text (Gee, Michaels, and O'Connor 1992)?; What topics repeatedly surface and intersect? I examined uses of reported speech (Besnier 1992) and deixis (in this case, the layered meanings and contexts implied in the use "they" and "we") (Hill and Irvine 1992). I used these techniques to illuminate the ways in which ideologies were expressed (Foucault 1972; Bourdieu 1991) and the ways in which speakers "contextualized" themselves vis-à-vis local and national discourses (Gumperz 1982; Alvarez-Caccamo 1996; Hill and Irvine 1992; Shuman 1992).

To analyze my national media data I performed a textual content analysis. I searched here, too, for recurring themes in the discourses. I asked, what patterns emerged in the media coverage of education, bilingualism and language politics, race, and immigration? How did discourses about each of these topics articulate to and across discourses about the other topics? How did these articulations encourage certain assumptions about English vis-à-vis other languages, particularly Spanish, in the public sphere and in regards to the education of America's next generation? ... about the "places" of African-Americans, Latinos and whites in sociopolitical and educational arenas?

I used the constant comparative method to trace the co-occurrences and articulations across research sites of the discursive patterns I saw at each site (Merriam 1998). I asked, how did the patterns in media discourses articulate to local school community member's discourses, and how did school community members both employ

and challenge the popular discourses? And to what end, ideologically and materially? I then traced the constancy and change in the discursive patterns, politics and articulations across time, from the mid-1990s through 2000. I used these methodological tools less to ensure that I got *the* right answer and more to help me get as close to how school community members themselves characterized things as possible while still being able to step back and comment on that; to help me clarify my positioned objectivity (Haraway 1988: 196). I strive for what Marcus (1998: 97) calls "reflexivity as method."

Research Context

Since its beginning in the early days of the colonies, the history of bilingual education in the United States has been connected to politics of immigration, nativism and national identity, shifting demographics, social change and movements for Civil Rights (*see Appendix*). Floating amongst historical and recent debates about language/s in schools have been questions about cultural citizenship writ large. Reporters, politicians, regular folks and pundits alike have wondered, Who are "we" as a nation?; What will America look like and be like in the future?; and, What can we do now to create the kind of nation and community that "we" want? (Gómez-Peña 1987, Higham 1994, McDonnell 1996).

South Central Elementary was an ideal place to explore how these questions were articulated at the local level in recent years: What better place to research the cultural politics of bilingual education than in the state named prime example of “the changing face of America” in the media, the destination point for the largest numbers of immigrants nationwide (Morganthau 1997)? What better place than a school in the state predicted to have the second-highest number of Latinos in the US by the year 2025, up to 43 percent of the state population (60)? What better place than California, which commands huge chunks of seats in Congress and a large number of electoral votes ("As goes California, so goes the nation," it is often said)? What better place than in a state

that was host to groundbreaking legislation mandating bilingual education in the first place? What better place than the Los Angeles Unified School District, which alone educates one fourth of the nation's Limited English Proficient/English Learner students (Los Angeles Unified Sschool District 1996c:3)? What better place than a school district where bilingual education was up until recently a large, established, well-funded program but where 1998's Proposition 227 basically gutted the institution, enlivened nationwide debate about the topic and sparked anti-bilingual education measures in several other states? *And what better place than a school I had actually taught in, where my research questions arose?*

CHAPTER 2 PRE-PROPOSITION 227 CONFLICT: NATIONAL MEDIA DISCOURSES

In media coverage of debates about bilingual education leading up to the mid 1990's, the complex "pro" and "anti" arguments were regularly presented in very simplistic terms (Valdés, A. 1979: 180). First, bilingual education was usually narrowly characterized as (only) a "Latino issue" (Attinasi 1997). Second, the “pro” and “anti” sides, while presenting opposing agendas, utilized similar discursive strategies in doing so, such as talk about equal opportunity, leveling the playing field, and essentialized characterizations of "America." Both sides often conflated concepts of language, race and national identity in their arguments. While much work on this subject has already been done (e.g. Crawford 1992a,1992b,1995; Gallegos1994; Estrada 1979; Cummins 1991; Crowley 1989; Casanova 1991), below I present my understandings and interpretations of the major themes in and differences between the "pro" and the "anti" bilingual education discourses that I tracked in national media debates pre-Proposition 227.

The “anti-” arguments

Most arguments against bilingual education leading up to the mid 1990's constructed the English language as the defining essence of American identity and culture. These arguments can be seen as what Bourdieu (1991) calls the struggle for a “normalized language” with which to fashion an ideal national “community of consciousness” (48). Handler (1988) explains how in nationalist discourses, a certain language is often understood to define the nation both sociologically and territorially. Given this static conception of the nation and its culture, Handler states, “The notion that people exposed to two cultures or two languages lose their identity and become confused and unable to function is a commonplace” (166). Bilingualism comes to symbolize a threat of cultural pollution and the impending “death of the nation” (169).

And so we read in the Los Angeles Times that Representative Jay C. Kim (R-Diamond Bar, CA) exclaimed, “We as a nation need to have a central functional identity in the English language” (Phinney and Reza,1996). And we heard in a 1996 TV news report on issues of language and schools, the opinion of a New York school board member:

> Well, here we are in the multicultural heartland and everything is in Spanish here. I don’t even feel like I’m in the United States. I feel like I’m in the middle of Latin America... In the old days, when they used to refer to an ethnic neighborhood, an Italian neighborhood... everything was still in English...You knew you were Americans” (20/20 1996).

And we read in the Washington Post that while Chinese, Haitian, Russian, Korean, Vietnamese, French, Greek, Arabic and Bengali speaking students (among others) received bilingual instruction in the US, the “real threat” was posed only by Spanish-English programs. “Hispanic cultures” were “less interested in assimilating” than other groups (Yardley 1994), we were told, particularly when compared to “earlier immigrants” from Europe who assimilated to become productive contributors to society (Glazer and Moynihan 1970, Walker 1987:17, Astroff 1988-89:15). Latino immigrants, we were told in the National Review, preferred to stay in “linguistic welfare” bilingual programs that did not really teach English and that drained the national coffers. By rejecting monolingual English instruction, then, Spanish-speaking immigrants “doomed themselves” to an uneven social and economic playing field, and shunned the “American Dream" (Porter 1990; McQuillan and Tse 1996).

This "problem" became even greater when we read in Newsweek, for example, that the “face” of America was changing (Morganthau 1997:58), becoming more Latino/Hispanic, more Brown. Latinos were the second-largest and fastest-growing minority group in the United States, we were told. “Whites could become a minority as early as the 2050’s" (59). And then we were warned in The Village Voice about the “traditions of corruption," the "political apathy,” and the carelessly “soaring birth rates” of new Latino immigrants that threatened the nation's peace and prosperity (Cooper 1994:

28). Bilingual education was portrayed as just one of the many problems—but the signature one—that Latino immigrants brought to the United States.

The "pro" arguments

In surveying national level debates about bilingual education leading up to the mid-1990's, I found much more coverage of the anti-bilingual education arguments. Though passionate, outspoken and often experienced in the field, bilingual education advocates were given less attention and bestowed less legitimacy by pundits and reporters. There are volumes of pro-bilingual education academic research, but this literature did not generally reach the public and was not referenced much in media coverage (McQuillan and Tse 1996: 14, 15).

Pro-bilingual education arguments were in a most basic sense profoundly counterhegemonic. Pushing for the recognition of languages other than English as legitimate vehicles for academic instruction, they challenged the increasingly powerful movements to make the public space of education monolingual English. They rejected the hegemonic, conservative stereotype of a homogeneous "American" identity in favor of a pluralist, multicultural one (Crowley 1989: 223; Lee 1992). This provided, at least potentially, for a space of difference, a bilingual stance from which to nurture a diverse yet "'united utterance'" (Crowley 1989: 223) against the monolingual status quo.

Professor Reynaldo Macías of the University of California at Santa Barbara asserted that even regardless of personal sentiment, anti-bilingual education efforts were outdated. In an increasingly global economy, multilingualism were a necessity. Contrary to the opinion that speaking other languages sapped patriotism and left speakers of other languages in an economic black hole, he pointed out that being bilingual would benefit businesspeople and the nation's economy (in Colvin 1996: A1).

While essentially counterhegemonic, however, many bilingual education advocates constructed their position similarly to their opponents. Indeed, I found that hegemonic ideological assumptions about bilingual education were "not the exclusive

property” of those perceived as occupying "the hegemonic" position of bilingual education opponents. The “underlying assumptions” of the "anti-" side were sometimes duplicated “in precise detail” by those espousing counter-hegemonic, pro-bilingual education ideals (Gilroy 1987: 64,40; see also Hall 1988).

First, they discussed bilingual education vis-à-vis an ideal American national community, the identity of which was assumed to manifest through language. Though they extolled the benefits of a linguistically and culturally plural nation, they often did so while reinforcing the primacy of English in America, and while framing the advantages of bilingualism in a nationalistic manner. In other words, they argued, one can champion diversity but must ground it in uniformity. While bilingual people can have “two worlds” in private or in classrooms or during a business deal, in the end the national community must be a “total social unit” within which assimilation to English “must prevail" (Handler 1988). English must be the “central component of a solidary national identity around which...all ethnic origins," and uses of other languages, "could be expected to rally” (159).

So we read in the Los Angeles Times a mother’s explanation that, "It is dehumanizing to steal a person’s language, their culture, their identity" by abolishing bilingual education. While English must be spoken by all, she agreed, Spanish was a family "treasure" that should also be honored (Matta Tuchman 1996: B7). And we read in the New York Times that, while "multilingualism improves communication” in our global economy and society, and helps immigrant communities share in the “reality” of American economic betterment, this betterment must still be grounded in English (Velásquez 1995).

Second, bilingual education defenders also portrayed the programs as tools to boost English learners on to a linguistically, culturally and economically level playing field with “mainstream” English speakers. In the Los Angeles Times a Chilean immigrant pleaded, “Of course everyone should learn English...but there needs to be a system to assist in the transition. That’s what bilingual [tax and ballot] forms and bilingual education are all about.” Like the anti-bilingual education arguments, many

bilingual education advocates constructed English as the ultimate goal, portraying the use of other languages as just a step towards English. Maintenance bilingual programs hardly registered on the map.

Third, as in much anti-bilingual education literature, bilingual education advocates often characterized non-English speaking communities as inherently inferior to English-speaking ones. For example, a teacher argued in the Los Angeles Times that, "The higher my students' skills are in their own dominant language, the more successful they're going to be in all subject areas in English... [As a result,] if you have students who feel confident and positive about who they are, they won't need to reach out to gangs or to other negative situations in the community" (Loar 1995). It seemed that by simply learning English through bilingual instruction children could steer clear of the dangerous influences of their a non-English-speaking community.

Additionally, most "pro" arguments also racialized bilingual education narrowly as a "Latino issue," establishing a Latino vs. mainstream and Spanish vs. English dichotomy. Though people insisted that bilingualism and cultural pluralism in general were desirable, the bilingual programs discussed were usually *Spanish*-English. Hardly any mention was ever made of the many other languages utilized in bilingual programs across the nation. The personal success stories of bilingual program graduates were about Latinos. The "LEP" students mentioned or quoted were Latino (Velásquez 1995; Pyle 1996; Loar 1995).

Balibar explains such discourses as indicative of the "immigration complex" (1991). In talk of "immigration problems," she argues, a myriad of social problems are condensed into one overwhelming lump of maladies and posited as caused by the singular "fact of the presence of immigrants" (or at least as "aggravated by them") (220). Talk of these maladies comes to set the parameters of debates about immigration, whether "pro-" or "anti-." The loaded signifier, immigrant, becomes "a gloss for national Other" (222). This signifier is then further conflated with a particular group of immigrants, racializing the troublesome Other--here, as Latino. This racialized category of Latinos/national Other/trouble makers/immigrants, explains Gilroy (1987), functions

as a complex political category in public discourse, accommodating various meanings according to perspective and shifting contexts of struggle (24, 38; see also Darder 1997).

State-level legislative back tracking

Just as anti-bilingual education discourses were accorded more space in national level media coverage of education politics, the institution of bilingual education was coming under attack by the mid 1990's at the state level. At the very time conflict at South Central Elementary erupted over the future of its bilingual program, anti-bilingual education factions were raising questions with the state Board of Education about the efficacy and future of such programs--and they were finding an audience. By July, 1995 the California Board of Education capitulated and began easing the terms of long standing, strict bilingual education mandates. They began allowing districts to implement alternative programs utilizing methods other than native language instruction with English Learners, as long as districts could "prove" that student progress would not be slowed down. Exactly how they would "prove" this was left vague (Pyle,1996: A1). This state-level legislative back tracking would provide fuel for the massive anti-bilingual education campaign, Proposition 227, in 1998.

The typification of Latino/African-American relations

Also leading up to the conflict over bilingual instruction at South Central were tentative media explorations of racial tension in Black and Latino neighborhoods. In "Racial Ideology in US Mainstream News Magazine Coverage of Black-Latino Interaction" (1991), Shah and Thornton contended that "Rapidly changing demographics over the past decade have brought blacks and Latinos into political and social conflict over scarce resources" (119; see Miles 1992 as a prime example). However, "Despite the importance and implications of these conflicts for American social relations--and especially for the 52.3 million blacks and Latinos in the United States--there has been

little news coverage" that went beyond the surface and almost no in-depth research on these dynamics (Shah and Thornton 1991: 119).

Shah and Thornton found that the "typification" of African-American/Latino relations in media coverage was extreme (133). While on the surface accurate perhaps, these media portrayals were usually "*incomplete because they block[ed] alternative ways of understanding issues* "(1991: 133, italics in original). Propagated by the "mostly white" press rooms (199), this then served "to organize public debate about race by establishing parameters within which interminority interaction is understood" (199). African-American/Latino interaction got presented in an "ahistorical manner" ignorant of group experiences, and portrayed shallowly as savagely conflict-ridden. The result, they concluded, was that the "social placements" of African-Americans and Latinos "on the racial hierarchy [were] naturalized...becom[ing] part of the 'common sense' reality about race in the United States" (131). It became 'natural', in other words, to think about Latinos and African-Americans as in opposing camps, battling out an issue of their own making. As we will see, this typification permeated local creations of and discourses about the boundaries within struggle.

CHAPTER 3 PRE-PROPOSITION 227: LOCAL CONFLICT

A school community in transition

I remember driving to South Central Elementary my first day on the job, just a few months after the 1992 "uprisings." Much of the area was still in ashes or in various states of repair. Of what was still standing, there were strip malls with doughnut shops, medical clinics, liquor stores, beauty shops, and check cashing establishments. There were Mexican food take out stands, a soul food restaurant and dollar Chinese food joints. Many corner buildings had murals of African-American historical figures, Mexican countryside scenes and the Virgin of Guadalupe. In the afternoon vendors with pushcarts sold *paletas* (popsicles) and other snacks. Residentially, this economically depressed neighborhood was composed of mostly small, single-family houses with small yards and front porches, and apartment buildings. The neighborhood was bordered on one side by a set of train tracks and in the surrounding area there were factories, produce distribution centers, and innumerable empty lots and alleys. The school's campus was comprised of two, two-story buildings and several trailer classrooms, a large blacktop play area, and an outdoor lunch pavilion. All was enclosed by a twelve-foot wire mesh fence that was locked from 7:30 a.m. until 2:30 p.m. every day. There was occasional gunfire heard and frequent helicopter-chaperoned "police activity" in the area.

The community had seen drastic demographic changes over the previous two decades. Up until then South Central L.A. was a predominantly African-American area, middle and working class. Explained one African-American teacher,

> My parents bought a house here in 1955. I went to South Central Elementary. It was a nice area... From '56 to '82 you still had older Black parents living here. Then they got better jobs and moved on to suburbs such as Rancho Cucamonga, Upland, Realto, San Bernadino, and Fontana. But the grandparents stayed until they died and now things are being sold to Latinos.

School district statistics reflected this change. According to the Program Evaluation and Assessment Branch of the LAUSD, the enrollment of Limited English Proficient students in 1981 was 117,388. By 1996 it was 300,980. At South Central Elementary the student body went from being overwhelmingly African-American just over two decades before my research began, to being 53% African-American and 47% Latino in 1980 (Los Angeles Unified School District 1996a). By 1995-96 the student body of 1,300 was just over 10% African-American and just under 90% Latino. That year only a small handful of Black students matriculated for kindergarten (according to the principal, personal communication). Of the Latino students in my bilingual classes, some were legal immigrants, some were second generation US citizens, and some were undocumented immigrants (they would tell me stories of coming to the US, wide-eyed and in a whisper, about running over the hills in San Diego by night, and about riding, scared, in the empty gas tank of a truck across a border checkpoint.

Though the community population was changing from mostly African-American to mostly Latino in the years leading up to 1987, until that year a large majority of the school's staff remained monolingual English speakers, many African-American. The demographic shifts that were occurring were basically absorbed into that organizational structure: As Latino English Learners entered the school some were placed in the existing English Only (EO) classes. Others were placed in modified bilingual classes, with both monolingual English speakers and English Learners; the teacher still delivered most of the instruction in English but there was also a bilingual Teacher's Assistant (TA). While these teachers did modify instruction to meet English Learners' needs, it was to a large extent the English Learners who had to adapt to the English speaking environment. Several staff members described the school's curricular focus prior to 1987 as "getting the new kids into English, fast."

In 1987 things changed. LAUSD implemented the Master Plan for Bilingual Education, a comprehensive policy mandate. A new administration was brought to South Central Elementary to implement the Master Plan. This administration began to group the English Learners into full bilingual classes taught by newly-hired, District- and state-

certified bilingual teachers. Those who had been teaching the English Learners up until that point were now being told that they "did not qualify" to teach them. Each year more bilingual staff was hired and more EO staff was displaced from the modified classes they had been teaching into the dwindling number of full EO classes. Cafeteria, campus security and office staff positions also began to be filled by bilingual personnel. Many of the Educational Aides (as teachers assistants in the EO program are called), all African-Americans, found their positions dropped from six hours a day to three so that three more hours could be filled with a new bilingual TA.

The majority of new bilingual teachers and staff were Latino, some of whom were immigrants themselves. A few were white (me for example) and still fewer were African-American (a fellow Teach For America corps member of mine, for example). The overwhelming majority of us were also District Interns. By the 1996-1997 school year roughly 17% of the school's personnel were African-American, 63% were Latino, about 1% were Asian and about 19% were white. There were 4 EO classes and 39 bilingual classes. Not only were bilingual jobs proliferating, but the LAUSD was also paying a bilingual stipend to teachers who passed District and state fluency exams. So, new bilingual teachers in positions once occupied by veteran EO teachers were getting paid up to $5,000 more a year. Monolingual teachers could take a state test in ESL methods to earn a half-as-much $2,500. More, when it came time each year for teachers to choose which class they would teach the next year (grade and track--this was a year-round, multi-track school), bilingual teachers were accorded first pick. These differences in compensation and professional perks became major points of contention.

Student achievement statistics became controversial. Bilingual Latino students were consistently out-scoring English speaking African-American students in *both* languages: Latino students transitioning from the bilingual program into EO classes were scoring higher on state standardized tests in *English*. Upper-grade EO teachers who received the transitioned students reported that, in the words of one, "The bilingual transitioned kids, nine times out of ten they are your top kids." And students in the

bilingual program were scoring higher, comparatively, on their exams in *Spanish* than were African-Americans in English (Los Angeles Unified School District 1994-95).

These developments and the tensions that began to build around them were exacerbated by another major change in the school community: the reorganization of campus decision making structures according to the new LEARN school reform model. LEARN, the Los Angeles Educational Alliance for Restructuring Now, was adopted by South Central Elementary just after I left in 1994 (it was rolled out to schools in the District in phases). Briefly, LEARN is an organizational model based on the principle of site-based management: "Virtually all decision making is moved to the school level and central administration shifts from the traditional role of command and control to one of advice and support" (Los Angeles Unified School District 1995). No longer did the principal have concentrated authority. Parents, staff, administrators and other community members were all now considered "stake holders" with a role in decision making.

Decision making power was now spread across councils and committees, and based on the concept of "consensus." Consensus was considered the point at which all stake holders agreed that a decision was satisfactory. Though this was one of the foundations of the LEARN philosophy I found it to be a problematic concept at this school. People did not seem to know how important decisions were actually made if there was contention amongst stakeholders (Did the principal have the power to break a tie, for example?). Hence when changes were noted that were not unanimously popular, people sometimes seemed unsure just how that decision was finalized (a vote they missed? the handiwork of a persuasive somebody on a certain committee?). Consequently they did not always know to whom to address a formal objection.

Some people I spoke with attributed the conflict over bilingual education in part to this difficulty. Said one TA, "Before the principal was in charge. Now no one is willing to give up their opinion and compromise. And since no one has the final say nothing gets done. LEARN has divided this school." To the contrary others agreed with this parent that, "LEARN really helped us because now everyone is heard and we're learning to communicate." Overall it was difficult to say just how much of an effect this

organizational change had on the school community and on this conflict. Certainly it complicated the question of who had control over issues important to dynamics of cultural citizenship--of who held the keys, so to speak, to decision-making power, to the ability to include or exclude, to the ability to be heard or not.

The financial “zero-sum game” was another major factor in the conflict in 1996: The EO and bilingual programs were in competition for limited resources. The school received funds for basic costs and large amounts of federal Title VII bilingual education funds and Title I funds for socio-economically disadvantaged students. With the adoption of the LEARN model the school site had the freedom to spend these funds within wide parameters, as stakeholders agreed was appropriate. The trouble was, as many people told me, given the set allotment to work with, “One more dollar for bilingual is one less for EO and vice versa.” For example, EO students could generally not read Spanish texts, and most bilingual program students in the lower grades could not yet read texts in English. And while EO students were fine with an English-speaking school psychologist many bilingual program staff members felt that English Learners needed a bilingual psychologist. Decisions about expenditures came to be interpreted as moral valuations, as how the school community *prioritized* the two programs' and the programs' students and staff needs.

Outlines of a conflict

Everyone I spoke to that summer portrayed these dynamics of change, competition and struggle as overwhelming, conflict ridden; in the words of many, as "a war." One “side" of the war was described me as those supportive of the bilingual program. They were “the bilingual people,” “the Latinos," the "Spanish people.” They could be teachers, TA’s, other staff members, parents, and administrators. That there were a few white and African-American people in bilingual positions or who were supportive of bilingual education was totally glossed over, never mentioned. I refer to the people on this "side" of the conflict as “Latino/bilingual.” I use this combination of

terms because they were so often used together or interchangeably (even by the same person in the same sentence) and because they contained the salient tension and conflation of the conflict--the racial ("Latino"), and the linguistic-pedagogical ("bilingual").

The other "side" was described to me interchangeably as "the African-Americans," "the EO's." They could be teachers, Educational Aides, other staff members, parents, and administrators. The fact that there were a few white EO teachers and a few Latino bilingual teachers who held views similar to those attributed to this side also seemed irrelevant. I call this side "African-American/EO." Again, I aim to remain true to the characterizations that school community members used to describe school community dynamics, and to maintain the terms in tension, in quotes throughout the text to emphasize the constructed, strategic nature of this conflation of racial, linguistic and pedagogical terms.

As the "Latino/bilingual," "African-American/EO" constructions highlight, I found that it was the racial categorizations *as connected to* the linguistic and pedagogical ones that became, in Urciuoli's terms, "metacommunicative" (1996: 8): It was these context-specific racial-linguistic-pedagogical categories that served as rhetorical "place markers" for a whole set of assumptions about and motivators for beliefs, group membership, and language and power issues (McCarthy and Crichlow 1993: viii; see also Frankenberg 1993; Peller 1995; Harris 1995).

Key voices in the conflict

I was not long into my summer research before I perceived that a few key voices were emerging in people's stories. It was these individuals who were mentioned and quoted most often when people told me what had been happening since I'd been gone. These individuals appeared to symbolize for many school community members the changes that had been taking place and/or to be spokespeople for their side. These key voices seemed to fall into three main groups: those on the "African-American/EO" side,

those on the “Latino/bilingual” side, and those in a third group of voices that I call “border crossers” (following Foley 1995; see also Giroux 1992b): Border crossers were school community members who did not neatly fit the ascribed profile of “their” side; they showed that their interpretive communities were heterogeneous within. For example, the people considered “African-American/EO” were African-American and EO but *a few* were white and Latino, and a few spoke some Spanish or even taught in the bilingual program. Those considered “Latino/bilingual” were Latino and bilingual but *a few* were white and a few African-American, and some spoke little Spanish. As for students, there were a small number of Latino students who began enrolling in kindergarten as EO in those years. Those students were mentioned in only two discussions all summer, most people glossing over their existence in conflations of EO with African-American and bilingual with Latino. Regarding agendas, there were times when people on either side would agree with aspects of the other side's agenda.

In conversation these people were pigeonholed to one side or another anyway, which I saw as limiting understandings of the richness of the multiple, contradictory, and complex subject positions that school community members occupied (Giroux 1992b). However, through talking with and about the these people I came to see that constructing them within the tightly-drawn "Latino/bilingual, "African-American/EO" perimeters also gave power and shape to each side’s arguments and agendas. The personal profiles below are intended to give a basic feel for the people on the South Central Elementary school campus in 1996. Of course the names of these people are fictional, though for South Central Elementary school community members who read this they will be recognizable.

Voices from the "African-American/EO" side

Michael attended South Central Elementary as a student and became involved at the school again as a family member of then-current students in 1994. He volunteered on campus in a variety of capacities for awhile and then became an Ed Aide. He also became active on the school's LEARN council and as such became involved in many

important decision making processes. Also a union representative, Michael was well known and active in many areas as campus life. He was somewhat controversial, with an interpersonal interaction style that led him to be liked by many but disliked by some, and a commitment to being a vocal advocate for Black students and staff members that led him to occasionally be the center of drama.

Eleanor was an Ed Aide and had been at the school for many years. She was very active, often volunteering to help with holiday celebrations, Career Days and other activities. She was a popular figure among Ed Aides and other Black classified personnel on campus. People were always talking with her about goings on and she always seemed to be a source of information, a gauge of community feelings, for me.

"African-American/EO" border crossers

Janice was probably the most often quoted voice for this "side." She was African-American and had been a teacher for almost 20 years by 1996, at this school site since 1982. She was trained in the local university system and held a lifetime credential and a master's degree in education. Janice had taught full EO classes a majority of the time but had also taught modified bilingual classes. She had served as union representative and on several committees at the school. Some people in the school community were intimidated by her because, they said, she's so outspoken. She said it was because, "I'm a strong black woman, and that's scary to some people." While not everyone I spoke with on the "African-American/EO" side agreed with everything Janice said she was often the one from this side to stand up in meetings and voice opinions.

Frank had been a teacher at the school for several years. African-American, he often argued forcefully in meetings for the "African-American/EO" position. However Frank taught full bilingual classes. This seemed to make some people uncomfortable and suspicious of his loyalty. One African-American teacher explained, "I applaud Frank for being *that way*," meaning, bilingual, "but I told him, 'You're still a Black man. Your mom and dad and you, are Black. Don't you forget that!'" Frank seemed to be committing (or, potentially committing) racial treason through bilingualism.

Roslyn had been at the school since 1992. A young African-American teacher, she, too, taught both EO and modified bilingual classes. In 1996 Roslyn took the out-of-the-classroom position of Title I Program Coordinator. She was known to many as an advocate for the African-American students at the school. As she explained, while she had Latino and Black children in her classes, "of course Black children are going to be closer to my heart, I share their experience. I'm going to fight for them." However, Roslyn was not only a graduate of the District Intern program, she became an instructor in the program in 1995. This was a touchy point because most of the District Interns at our school were Latino and/or bilingual. Roslyn did not escape unscathed for this, either. When she ran for the Title I coordinator position against an older and non-DI African-American teacher she won the race but only by a few votes and several on the "African-American/EO" side told me they did not vote for her because, "all the DI's" were "only taught to care about the LEP's."

A final border crosser on the "African-American/EO" side was Elizabeth. Elizabeth was a border crosser for the simple fact that she broke the mold by being white. Elizabeth had been at South Central for several years. She was not a particularly vocal participant in public conflict, but would occasionally argue a very "pro-EO" position in lunchtime or parking lot conversations with colleagues. She once also admitted to me feeling pressure to adapt to the school's overwhelmingly bilingual environment: "I'm taking Spanish classes. If not, they'll be no place for me here."

Voices from the "Latino/bilingual" side

Enrique was cited by most people as, to put it in the words of one, the "bilingual ringleader." Enrique came to the US from Mexico as a young child. A graduate of the District Intern Program, from 1993 through 1996 he taught bilingual classes. In 1996 he took the out-of-the-classroom position of Bilingual Program Coordinator. As bilingual coordinator Enrique was in charge of assessing all incoming students who declared Spanish as their home language, as to whether they should be placed in the EO or bilingual program. He was dealt with the large bilingual program budget and oversaw

the professional support of all bilingual staff at the school. Consequently many on the "African-American/EO" side charged that Enrique was in part responsible for what they saw as the neglect of African-American students and for "the LEP' s not transitioning into English fast enough."

Crystal had been a Teacher's Assistant in the bilingual program since 1990. In 1996 her sister and brother also worked at the school as TA's and campus security aides. Crystal's family had come to Los Angeles from Mexico when she was a young child. She took pride in being bilingual and in working to help other immigrants achieve success in school. Crystal was not often singled out as a "bilingual ringleader" nor was she particularly outspoken in public debates about school politics. However, she was well liked amongst bilingual program teachers, parents and administrators, she was popular amongst the TA's, and I found her opinions about school politics to be representative of many of the TA's.

"Latino/bilingual" border crossers

Like Elizabeth, simply by being white Scott etched a fissure into the discursively constructed "Black-Brown" dichotomy of the conflict. In 1996 he had been at the school only a few years. Scott was the perpetrator of "the black face incident" (a defining moment in this conflict that I discuss in detail later). In fact, he often did and said things offensive to "African-American/EO" school community members. However his whiteness seemed to be overshadowed by his bilingual-ness because his actions and statements were described to me as examples of the offenses of "the bilinguals."

Linda was a white teacher who had taught in the bilingual program since 1990. She was a controversial figure at South Central Elementary because she was very vocal in defending the bilingual program during faculty meetings, in the lunch room, and in personal interaction. She was also a union representative in the mid-1990s. Her pro-bilingual stance was noted by many "African-American/EO" school community members as an example of how the campus environment was becoming increasingly hostile to Black and monolingual English speaking people.

Andrea was the bilingual program coordinator from 1990 until 1996. In 1996 she ran for the newly vacated assistant principal position. School community members on the "Latino/bilingual" side expressed unreserved support for her candidacy. "She really has the kids' needs at heart," they told me, citing her work as a coordinator. Many on the "African-American/EO" side expressed disapproval of her candidacy. If she were elected, one parent said, "Our kids wouldn't have a chance against the bilingual agenda." In these ways Andrea was portrayed as yet another threatening "bilingual" authority figure, or as another needed "bilingual" advocate. She was not usually characterized as a "white person" in authority.

Throughout this text I quote both these key voices and many other school community members. I will sometimes indicate who a speaker is, when it will help to enrich the reader's understanding of that person's position or motivations. I will also follow certain "key voices" into later chapters in order to trace experiences of the politics of bilingual education across the pre-227 to post-227 timeline. I will sometimes *not* indicate who a person quoted is, but refer to them in general terms like, "A teacher," or, "One staff member," etc.. I hope that this sometimes revealing, sometimes protective strategy of identification and quotation will allow the reader to understand individual stories while still affording some measure of anonymity to school community members who were so graciously open with me, with their passionate and sometimes politically risky opinions.

"It's a Black-Brown thing"

It's mid-February, 1996 in this South Central Los Angeles community. At the school today, the auditorium is the center of activity. The long-anticipated Black History Month Program is about to begin. People file in and sit on long wooden benches in anticipation, facing the stage. The whole school community is in attendance--students, staff and parents. As they wait they gaze up at the large banners on the walls that proclaim, "Believe and Achieve! ¡Piensa y Realiza!" Backstage, a white bilingual

teacher prepares his students to perform a song about African-American bus riders in the Civil Rights era; he is applying theater makeup to their faces. The stage manager, also a white teacher in the bilingual program, sees this but says nothing and ushers them out onto the stage. Out in the audience a hush falls as the lights dim and curtains rise. People watch as a group of fourth grade students, all Latino, walk out on stage painted in black face. As soon as the song ends several African-American faculty and staff members rush to the offending teacher and to the administrators. The arguments, anger, disbelief and apologies that ensued in the following weeks became known collectively on campus as, "the black face incident."

The "black face incident" was the story most frequently told when people explained the "war" to me. But while there was a certain level of common interpretation (it was unfortunate that it happened), the import ascribed to it varied. In fact, I heard tell of the incident so many times that in its retelling it seemed to become a complex discursive symbol through which other moments of the conflict were interpreted, constructed and conveyed. In Woolard's (1989) words, the incident became a "key symbol" in this school community's debates about the future of bilingual education. Key symbols, Woolard explains, can provide the discursive means through which people may meaningfully disagree. Stories about this emotionally loaded symbol seemed to me to be what Bourdieu (1991) calls, “performative” utterances (128): discursive attempts to legitimate the speaker’s position in the struggle and to delegitimize the position of the Other side. I saw school community members attempting, “to produce and impose representations of the social world” that would exercise “constitutive power” over understandings of what should most logically be done to resolve this controversy about bilingual education (128). These stories also seemed to approximate Gal's (1994) discussion of strategic discourses in Eastern European debates about abortion: the discourses were as much a way of shaping the ways in which people imagined, represented, and understood their opposition to socialism and their relationships to each other as they were about the topic of abortion. Indeed, how people discussed the "black

face incident" gave me insight not only into "what happened" on stage that day but into how people understood all manner of points of contention, how they constructed their own and others' positionalities and cultural citizenship status, and how they saw all this relating to sociopolitical dynamics on a national scale.

"We're not even worth a rewrite": "African-American/EO" constructions of school community dynamics

For many "African-American/EO" school community members, the black face incident brought up questions that had already been brewing: Who are "we" as a school community, anymore? Just who belongs? Are African-Americans and monolingual English speakers valued? In addition to the affront of the black face incident itself, most people I spoke with on this side of the school community felt that the way it was dealt with was appalling: A few days after the incident the school sent a letter of apology from Scott to all parents. The letter was in a bilingual format and was prepared by the office staff (which was majority Latino), as were most documents that were sent home. But unlike with most documents, there were glaring discrepancies between the English and Spanish copies. The English version was just a xerox of the teacher's original scribbled manuscript. It appeared hastily written and utterly unedited. The Spanish translation, however, was neatly typed in business letter format, placed on letterhead, and worded in the properly formal language. An African-American parent said to me, "See? This whole black face thing is just another example of how bilingual people treat Blacks in the community. We're not even worth a rewrite."

The lack of worth of African-Americans in the school community was further described to me as evidenced and caused by the following: unequal representation in positions of power; unfair hiring practices; disrespectful treatment of staff, parents and students; an inferior academic program for EO students; racism; and "Latino/bilingual" greed for power and money. The Black-Brown "war" was also sometimes attributed to a

culture clash between African-Americans and Latinos, and between Latinos and "America."

Regarding unequal representation in positions of power, numerous people argued that a higher “Latino/bilingual” student population did not justify what they saw as disproportionate representation of “Latino/bilingual” people in leadership posts. The principal was very “pro-bilingual" (not mentioned was the fact that she was white). She had just replaced a Black principal who had been perceived by most on campus as “pro-EO" (he held the position during the time I was gone, 1994-1996). The vice principal, Andrea, used to be the bilingual program coordinator and was outspokenly “pro-bilingual" (also hardly mentioned was that she was white). More, they argued, one of the few “African-American/EO” school community members in a position of power was not receiving proper support. The school's official parent representative on various committees, an African-American man, was having difficulty getting concerns heard and was rumored to be the target of a plot to replace him with a Latina. And so I heard repeatedly this teacher’s sentiments:

> We’re treated as if we’re outsiders. They say, ‘We’re a bilingual school...oh, yea, and there’s a few African-Americans.' It’s as if, 'Soon there won’t be any EO’s so let’s not bother with them.' But the way I see it even if there’s only one EO student he deserves attention! If there were more Black people here things like this wouldn’t happen.

Hiring practices and treatment of staff members were also unfair, many argued. People who were bilingual but otherwise inexperienced were hired to fill open teacher and TA positions. Even in cases where it seemed that language abilities were “irrelevant,” “African-American/EO” people were not selected. Eleanor explained,

> I missed a job once because they *claimed* they needed a bilingual person. The woman who got the job spoke Spanish but she failed the basic skills test and I passed. And in the end there weren’t even any LEP kids in the class! I don’t have anything against Spanish speakers. In certain areas they need a [bilingual] TA but here Black people could at least work on the yard [supervising recess and

> lunch]. I got nieces and things coming up who need jobs but they won't be able to get one. It's not fair!

Worse yet, several people explained, was the District's refusal to offer monolingual English speaking professionals opportunities to become bilingual and hence marketable. The District offered free language courses but this was not enough. Said one teacher, "I don't know how the District expects us to become bilingual if they don't give us bilingual classes [to teach]. How can you learn it without speaking it every day?"

Stories of unequal treatment of students were also ubiquitous. "African-American/EO" students were unfairly stereotyped as trouble makers, many reported, and they got harsher punishment for misbehavior than "Latino/bilingual" students. Explained one teacher, "There are always three or four Black boys, Black boys only, sitting on the bench in the office. I find it hard to believe that they are so bad inherently." And recently, "there was an African-American child and a Latino child who both did bad things. The Hispanic one, who was worse, got nothing, got sent home. But the African-American child got hand-cuffed by the police and taken away!"

Regarding the perceived inferior academic program for "African-American/EO" students, the discrepancy in test scores noted earlier was cited as the ultimate proof. Said one parent, "Black students are being allowed to fall behind. They're not given a fair chance. People here, their major concern is bilingual education. We are overflowing with Spanish books. Our kids don't have access to the same kinds of resources." One Educational Aide commented, "Spanish students get all kinds of homework and hard work but African-American kids don't get any, or they get it accidentally sent home in Spanish! Who's monitoring the EO's to make sure they get the right homework, or that they can read by second grade?" Not the administration, one parent told me. She recounted the story of her last visit to campus, one that she said typified the experiences of other parents as well:

> I was never told anything until I was called for a meeting about my son's progress by the principal and the psychologist. When I got there they left to go look at

> something in the hall and they never came back! They just left me sitting there and never even told me what the meeting was for!

One respite in these dynamics was provided by the previous principal (who held the position in the years I was gone, 1994-1996). He was Black and a vocal proponent of the EO program. "African-American/EO" school community members portrayed him positively: He was "fair," they told me. "He paid attention to the needs of *all* kids, not just the bilinguals." They cited for example his purchase of the Proficiency in English Program (PEP), a Standard English language development program. PEP was seen as a resource for improving African-American students' command of Standard English as well as a supplementary tool for ESL with Latino English Learners, but it was culturally associated with African-American students.

Many people maintained that racism was behind what "Latino/bilingual" school community members believed, said and did. "Latino/bilingual" teachers, I was told, avoided African-American students due to racist sentiments and assumptions. Said one Educational Aide,

> None of the so-called bilingual teachers want to bother with Black kids, especially the boys. I've heard a few say so. It's a race thing. Some of the Latino teachers are scared of the Black kids! Many Black students do have hard lives, don't have two parents at home like the Latino kids. But that doesn't make them inherently bad kids! We need to work with *all kids* , not a color. We need to get away from pro-color and be pro-*education* .

People reported frequent racist public remarks. Scott was quoted by many to have said in a staff meeting about school discipline, "I don't have any behavior problems in my class because my kids are all Hispanic." That statement, said a parent, "was an accusation that African-Americans *are* the problem."

People also argued that this racist behavior took the form of taking advantage of "African-American/EO" students during "mixing" time. Federal anti-segregation laws mandated that where the division of students along language lines amounted to de facto racial separation (as was the case at our school), twenty percent of every school day had

to be spent in joint activities during Art, Music and/or PE. These "mixing" activities were to be language-rich, in English, and carefully geared to the linguistic strengths and needs of both the native English speaking and English Learner participants. Mixing was supported by many on the "Latino/bilingual" side because it offered English Learners the opportunity to hear native spoken English and to practice speaking English. To the contrary, many on the "African-American/EO" side agreed emphatically with Janice that,

> It's racist. Bilingual teachers are supposed to bring Hispanic kids to my room, and my African-American kids are supposed to talk to them and prepare them for life? No. Black people, we think mixing is like going back to slavery, that you're treating our kids like quote on quote niggers.

What "African-American/EO" school community members brought up most frequently, however, as a topic of contention was the pay differentials that bilingual teachers received and unequal program funding. The bilingual stipends of up to $5000 (depending on how many of the qualifying tests teachers had passed) were seen as blatantly unfair. Argued one teacher, "People get to come here and take a test in their native language and get the $5,000. I can't come here and take a test in my native language and get $5,000!" Not only was the differential unfair but it contributed to bilingual teachers not wanting to teach Black children *and* not wanting to teach English to English Learners, many people told me. Said a parent, "There's a lot of money in bilingual education and they don't want to give it up. They want their stipends." And analyzing the issue on a larger, programmatic scale she added, "As a whole program there's more money in bilingual ed. Think about it, they have to keep bilingual ed going because if all the kids transition to English, there goes their money. It's not fair and it doesn't make any sense. What about spending our money on English stuff?"

Articulating to national media discourses

On several occasions people also explained the conflict in terms prevalent in the media discourses, articulating culture, language and nation. They attributed a certain amount of the problems on campus to the "Latino/bilingual" side's unruly, dirty, or otherwise disreputable living habits and culture. English was posited as synonymous with the American nation and Spanish as an illegitimate threat, a placemarker for the "borders" of appropriate national belonging (Williams 1989: 439). Constructions of Spanish-speaking Latino immigrants as unassimilating, non-citizen "invaders" positioned them as trouble-makers.

Both in certain living habits, as American citizens, and as English speakers, African-Americans were often constructed as having a superior culture to Latinos. They were portrayed in ways similar to white middle class Americans in national debates--as the prototypical Americans suffering the burdens of welfare and other social problems at the hands of culturally deficient Others. For example, when I asked the parent representative to explain why he had said that the neighborhood's demographic shift had lead to this conflict, he said:

> These new Hispanic folks, they do things that African-Americans just don't do, it's not their [African-Americans'] culture. One African-American family moves out and five Hispanic families move in--to one house! I don't wanna sound prejudiced or racist, but the value of the property goes down, the attraction to the area diminishes when you see vendors on the street, when you see clothes hanging on fences, or when you see a yard with five or six dogs, and I'm not talking well kept animals, I'm talking hounds! I went recently to a parent workshop here and they had a Spanish presenter and no English translation. I don't think I should have to go to a meeting in my own country and wear translation devices. Is this America or what? I have nothing against Hispanics, but I believe they are the sole reasoning behind welfare reform, year-round schools, a lot of our problems.

And Eleanor stated,

> Programs get jeopardized because some bilingual teachers here don't speak English well and they aren't American citizens, they're Mexican or Spanish

> citizens [the school employed a few teachers from Spain and Mexico as part of a District exchange program]. ESL has gone ka-boom. Kids aren't learning English. We get fifth graders who've been here since kindergarten and they still can't transition [out of the bilingual program]. How can that be? It doesn't make sense. Do we want our kids to be good, successful citizens and know American language and culture? What's the goal?

What it came down to, numerous people argued, is that "Hispanics are trying to take over." According to some, they already had. One teacher chalked up all the school's ills to the fact that, "This district went crazy when it went 100% Hispanic."

These quotes echoed not only the hegemonic anti-bilingual education discourses of the time that linked "Americanness" with English, but also drew upon the assumptions about culture and belonging put forth by Oscar Lewis in 1966. In his theory of "the culture of poverty" he argued that poor people adapted to poverty by developing a way of life utterly outside the mainstream. Typical were unorganized and mother-centered families and a refusal to assimilate to dominant values of upward mobility and thrift. These characteristics were passed from mother to child, Lewis maintained, through family (read: blood) lines. This process of quasi-biological cultural transmission was so thorough, he argued, that by the age of 5 or 6 children's mental and social growth were forever stunted. Hence, even improved economic or other opportunities became useless (60-79). Poor people, he argued, would just naturally remain poor and pass these debilitating, alienating cultural characteristics to the next generation.

In popular discourse this theory has almost exclusively been applied in explanations of the chronic poverty and academic underachievement of racialized groups, constructing them as inherently inferior to "mainstream Americans" (as gloss for the white middle class) (e.g. Puerto Ricans [Bourgois1995], Mexicans [Lewis1964], and African-Americans [Williams, W. 1995; Moynihan1965]). These constructions have served to rationalize and maintain systems of dominance and privilege. In particular, debates about *African-American* language and culture (and their implications for learning and success in mainstream arenas) have been lively for decades (Weinstein 1983; Solá and Bennett 1991; Smitherman and Van Djik 1988; Los Angeles Unified School District

1996b; Labov 1972; Gilmore 1991; Fordham 1996; Baugh 1984; Attinasi 1997). Hence this move to align African-Americans with hegemonic ideals of superior American culture and English monolingualism can be seen as strategic "performative utterances" (Bourdieu 1991), as moves to secure a better place to "stand" (hooks 2000) in relation to "Latinos/bilinguals" in the local community and in the American socioeconomic hierarchy.

This move to champion the ideal that English (only) was appropriate in American schools can be considered even more strategic when we note that it completely contradicted the policy agenda espoused by most "African-American/EO" school community members I talked to during this time. This agenda, as we will see, proposed a dual immersion bilingual program so that Latino *and* African-American students could attain Spanish-English bilingualism--so that *all* of the students at South Central Elementary could become successful in the ever-more diverse social landscape.

As we will see, I found that school community members' use of culture of poverty discourses on both sides of this "war," while different in the details, were constructed in similar terms and brought to bear on school community dynamics in comparable ways. I believe this suggests that these "opposing sides" had more in common than was generally alluded to: After such scholars as Piatt (1997), Attinasi (1997), Darder (1997) and Smitherman (1992), I posit that in certain ways important for linguistic and educational politics, actors on both sides inhabit analogous positionalities vis-à-vis hegemonic constructions of the ideal American nation, its language, its culture; and within the national socioeconomic hierarchy. In drawing on these hegemonic discourses school community members could also be seen to lend consistency to them and to their effects on a national scale.

Where should "we" go from here? Local agendas and connections to national discourses on the "African-American/EO" side

"African-American/EO" school community members' answers to this question were almost uniformly two-sided. When discussing the bilingual program in its current

form, available to only Latino English Learners, I heard vehement accusations similar to those in anti-bilingual education media discourses: that bilingual education was un-American, unfair, and ineffective in providing students with the dominant cultural capital of English that they lacked. In this case, English was the valued competency and Spanish the devalued competency. However these condemnations of the current situation often dissolved when it came to creating future agendas for the school. When discussing what directions the school should take people reminded me that monolingual African-American students were falling behind their biliterate Latino counterparts academically, and that biliterate adults had more job opportunities, security, and professional advantages. Though many charged that "Latino/bilingual" students were not learning English fast enough, in daily experience at South Central Elementary English no longer appeared to be the status quo competency that English Learners had to acquire in order to have an equitable chance in a monolingual English "mainstream."

Now Spanish seemed to be the "legitimate competence" (Bourdieu 1991) that students needed *in addition to* English to be appropriately educated in an *increasingly bilingual mainstream*. Many "African-American/EO" school community members now argued that without this locally valued bilingualism students would grow to be "de facto excluded" from the social domains in which this competence was increasingly required (55), such as the job market. They argued that without biliteracy "African-American/EO" students would be "condemned [to] silence" (55) as their "Latino/bilingual" counterparts passed them by.

Now people stated that American public education had to live up to its commitment to equal access to opportunity for all by providing program that would allow *all* students to achieve biliteracy in Spanish and English. The words of Frank were echoed by several others:

> We've been talking about bilingualism forever. But 'bilingualism' here means Spanish speakers get to learn Spanish *and* get pushed into English. I always thought that 'bilingual' meant everyone learns two languages. Black kids are

> getting a second-rate education. Why can't they learn Spanish? Why can't they be bilingual and get ahead, too? Huh, 'bilingual', what a misnomer.

One day during recess Janice and I were talking and she added this perspective on the pragmatics of bilingual education policy at South Central Elementary-- a perspective many others shared:

> I know there's a need for bilingual education. People don't know this but I have studied bilingual education, I know the theory. I see it work at this school and I agree with it in principle. But I don't support [it] here because of how it was pushed on us. When they started the bilingual program we got no input and suddenly EO's became disrespected, second class citizens in our own school... Bilingual ed has to go!

Just a few moments later when I asked her what we could do to improve the education of Black students on campus she reflected, "I see all the jobs here going to bilinguals. Things are changing, Spanish is an important skill… So why leave EO's behind? Why can't African-American students also have bilingual education?"

This brings to mind Urciuoli's (1996) discussion of the pragmatics of English and Spanish in a Puerto Rican New York community. She explains that for these bilinguals Spanish and English as codes were not themselves imbued with socially meaningful qualities. Instead it was the "structures," or "specific relations and contexts" (76) within which these codes were spoken that lent them their social significance (50). I see similar dynamics expressed in the contradictory stances taken towards Spanish and English by actors in this Los Angeles school. Spanish was not always considered un-American, ineffective, or devalued; it was only considered so when it was positioned vis-à-vis currently hegemonic, pro-English Only media rhetoric--and when it was seen as unattainable by "African-American/EO" school community members. When Spanish was placed in relation to actual local experiences where bilinguals held advantageous positions and when there seemed to be a *possibility* to empower all students through a dual language program, Spanish became desirable, bilingualism a goal.

This proposal for a dual language bilingual program amounted to a drastic rejection of national media/political typifications of the issues involved in bilingual education. It was now clearly not just a "Latino issue." Nor was it simply about a group of students catching up to an established status quo. It was now about connecting to an emergent status quo in a changing American ethnoscape. This redefinition of the stakes of bilingual education was based, however, squarely within the enduring hegemonic discourse of American public institutions' responsibility to provide equal opportunity for all. This same logic that went into legislating bilingual education in the first place (in Lau v. Nichols 1973) was now used to re-envision its scope.

Whose knowledge is of most worth?

This two-pronged anti- and pro-bilingual education agenda lead to a similarly fractured position in regards to appropriate knowledge for educators. Just what should educators know and what experiences should be valued? Though Spanish now seemed crucial for "African-American/EO" students, it was often still presented as unnecessary for educators. Many school community members found themselves in the dilemma of demanding for the children something they themselves did not possess (or, that they did not yet know fluently). Janice shared with me her response to people on the hiring committee who argued that teachers applying to teach bilingual classes, which were the only open positions at the time, had to pass the District fluency test (which was a Master Plan requirement):

> I have a lifetime professional multisubject kindergarten through adult credential, a master's degree, a Language Development Specialist credential, and three times as many years' teaching as them [new bilingual teachers]. Don't come at me with that Spanish! People think that's all they need, but just because they have shoes on doesn't mean they can walk. Someone said I couldn't teach a bilingual class because I don't speak Spanish. I told them I can teach any kids, I'm a professional! We'll make up our own language!

In these reflections we see a tension inherent in this kind of transformative vision for universal biliteracy: How to forge the future with the tools of the present? How to validate something for the next generation that invalidates or out-dates important aspects of our own knowledge and experience?

"I used to hear 'wet backs' a lot": "Latino/bilingual" constructions of school community dynamics

"I couldn't believe it, the black face thing. I couldn't believe that teacher was so insensitive. But he said it was an accident, that he didn't know what black face meant. So we just have to get over it and move on," one Latino teacher told me. Many others concurred. Some did not even understand the excitement over black face to begin with. Explained one parent,

> Afterwards some of the Latino people didn't understand what was so offensive. They didn't grow up in this country and didn't know the history of it. Their indifference made people even madder. I might be one of them who didn't understand what the big deal was. But I still feel some things need to be put behind us.

Indeed, most on the "Latino/bilingual" side saw the incident less as an affront to Black school community members and more as evidence that conflict had to be "put behind us" because, "*everything's* going crazy around here." And to a few, the after-event dynamics even became proof of an *anti-"Latino/bilingual"* environment in the community. A few teachers recounted the faculty meeting just after the incident like this one:

> When the Black teachers were expressing their feelings about the prejudice they felt towards them they were expressing prejudice about Latinos! ... So I said--near tears--that I'd just been insulted. Some of them didn't understand that and some didn't care, and some thought it was good. They felt satisfied that I was offended, and this was allowed to go on at the meeting!

For most on this side, then, the black face incident became one of many things that needed to be dealt with so that the main issues plaguing the school could be addressed: a perceived campaign to keep "Latino/bilingual" people out of positions of power; racism; unequal treatment of staff members; the uphill battle to provide Latino students with appropriate bilingual instruction and to be accepted in the community. Asserted another teacher,

> We're a majority Latino school and we have to serve the community. Bilingual education here suffers because of resentment and misunderstanding. The EO program is doing its job. The kids are learning at their level. EO's ask, 'Why are Spanish kids pushed on reading and writing and not Blacks?' We should address why second grade EO's aren't reading. But you can't help it. We're a predominantly Latino school and we have so far to go with the bilingual program. LEP's have to be given a fair shot and they don't have that yet. When I first came here they said lots of insulting things about bilingual education, District Interns and Hispanics in general. ... I used to hear 'wetbacks' a lot.

Hearing slurs like " wetback" were not the only instances of racism that people related to me. Many maintained that certain Black school community members had been plotting the unfair election of more Black people to positions of power. For example, at that time the reelection of the school's official parent representative (mentioned earlier) was vehemently opposed by some on the "Latino/bilingual" side. They told me they opposed his reelection because he was illegally elected in the first place: the previous principal had held "a secret meeting," they told me, on a day when Andrea was absent. "He only invited African-Americans. That's how [the representative] got elected." So it was obvious, many contended, that "African-American/EO" school community members had been systematically attempting to exclude those on the "Latino/bilingual" side from fair participation in decision making processes. Other people cited the previous principal's perceived efforts to help only African-American candidates for the vice principal position which had opened up a few months before my research began. They said that he was a member of an organization which held "secret" study groups for African-American candidates for the District principal's and vice principal's exams. "It's

always a racial thing," a few people argued. "To me," said one, "any group shouldn't preclude the success of other groups. Racism always comes from those who say they don't have it. It has really hurt the school community."

Explaining their opinion that "African-American/EO" school community members were receiving unfair special treatment as of late, many on this side of the conflict accused the previous principal of having "favored the EO's." Said one teacher, "We asked him for substitute release days so we could work on the Cinco de Mayo celebration and he said, 'No.' Then for days important to EO's like Career Day they did get substitutes." Worse still, another commented, he "tried to destroy bilingual education. He said we couldn't have a bilingual advisory council any more [a parent-administrator-teacher group to guide certain decisions such as program purchases]. We did the best we could anyway but he made it hard. And he said he was going to modify all the classes! That's taboo!" Modifying the bilingual classes would have involved reorganization of the entire school in order to put EO's and English Learners together in the same classes (like my class was my first year teaching in the other district, and like many classes before the mid-1990s at South Central)--and hence, some thought, their Spanish fluency level would be less of a factor in determining teachers' choice of grade and track assignments (i.e. their advantage would be gone). Because of this principal, several people agreed, "The bilingual program began to fall apart. He just about ruined the school."

Additionally, many felt that "Latino/bilingual" school community members were underrepresented in school politics. One teacher pointed out that,

> I'd show up at meetings and I'd be the only Latino. African-Americans had learned the game: If you want to change things go to meetings. If I was the only Latino and there were six African-Americans, concerns at the meeting were only about EO's. If African-American kids are only ten percent [of the student body] how can they say EO kids are not represented, when the bilingual program isn't even fully implemented yet? I told the bilingual teachers, 'You all have to start showing up!'

Finally, monetary and material concerns often arose: As mentioned earlier, the mid-1990's were a time of growing anti-bilingual education and anti-immigrant sentiments in the US. When I asked one TA about any news she'd heard recently that might affect the school, she replied, "Proposition 187. Governor Wilson doesn't want to give education to immigrants." She then looked at me nervously and exclaimed, "If 187 passes where would our [bilingual program] jobs go?!" When teachers mentioned Proposition 187, corresponding concerns often arose about the potential loss of lucrative bilingual stipends (that would result from the drop in needed bilingual teachers if "illegal immigrants" were banned from California schools). Linda told me, "I need that money! They're never going to get the teachers they need if they take away those stipends."

The perceived monetary and political greed of "African-American/EO" school community members was frequently cast in terms of a "turf war." Enrique's assessment was shared by several others I spoke with:

> Any time you have a Brown wave enter an African-American area there's a turf war. Blacks in this country saw the beginning and the end of Affirmative Action in their own lifetimes. Here in South Central Blacks still dominate politics and so they feel the threat of Latino business power. They're fighting to keep control. Latino gangs are also starting to control the drug trade in the illegal realm. In order for Latinos to move up others have to move out, and so this thing is Black versus Brown.

This monetary and political greed surfaced, several people opined, when "African-American/EO" staff members objected to certain things that "Latino/bilingual" school community members saw as fair and logical. A prime example noted was their objections to the bilingual stipend. Another was their disapproval of the seniority that bilingual teachers were given over EO teachers when choosing grade and track for the next year. The reason for these things, they reminded me, was because of the needs of the growing English Learner population. "African-American/EO" staff members were "just complaining," TA's and teachers would say. In the words of one: "They're not taking into account what's good for the *kids*. They're only worried about themselves. They just want the money and positions we can get because of our expertise." These

sentiments reflected concerns comparable to those on the "African-American/EO" side. Not only were unequal treatment and discrimination, unequal representation in decision making, and the equitable education of all children important issues. Economic opportunity was at stake.

Articulating to national media discourses

In constructing their cases about the "war" at South Central Elementary, a few people explained it to meet as playing out in national terms common in media debates. Recalled a TA at lunch one day,

> When I came here [to the US] I was mystified about English. There was so much hostility towards Latinos! If you spoke Spanish people would say, 'You're in America, speak English.' But Americans speak English overseas so why can't people speak another language here?

Evoking pro-bilingual education discourses in the media about leveling the playing field and preparing students for a diverse world, Enrique added,

> My dad came here as part of the Bracero program, then we came when I was six. I was multiplying and dividing when I got here but I was put in the back of the classroom to *draw* because they didn't have a bilingual program and didn't know what to do with me. So I lost my edge, I stopped learning in the subject areas. Because of this I'm not going to give up my quest for bilingual education here and now. Our kids need that edge in today's multicultural world.

And many people drew a picture of the conflict as caused by a refusal to recognize that immigration and bilingualism were natural elements of the American nation. For example, Crystal asserted,

> Today we live in a global village and our kids have to be ready for that. But *some people* want to pretend that we are still very tribal. There are a lot of immigrants coming but America has always had immigrants and lots of languages! They always say we Latinos are taking over their jobs, taking over the country. But

> they should realize that people from other races aren't willing to work the land in this country. We are. That's what makes the heart of the country.

Like their "African-American/EO counterparts, talk of the other side's culture also formed part of "Latino/bilingual" community members' discursive repertoire as they attempted to describe "the war" to me in ways that gave advantage to their side. Evocative of the culture of poverty theory, "African-American/EO" students were repeatedly portrayed by those on the "Latino/bilingual" side as growing up in dysfunctional homes and as such, being somewhat lost cases. African-Americans were also constructed as rejecting vigorous participation in the national economy. And parallel to the stories earlier, now "Latino/bilingual" school community members were discursively aligned with an idealized American culture and its essential language practices. For example, when I asked people, "So what caused this conflict?," a vast majority responded in ways quite similar to this teacher:

> The demographics are changing. We need to understand migration issues. It is not because the kids are Black, it's because of the lives they lead and what they learn at home. They're malfunctional because of their families. Those African-Americans who pulled their resources together moved out. So the ones who stayed in South Central are a low quality of folks, and so are their children. We do everything in our power to help them grow up and be open minded but when they go home they fall back into square one. Of the Mexican immigrants who came here, they are the ones who can pull themselves together, which got them to the US in the first place.

I interpret these characterizations of Latinos as valuable economic producers for the nation and as prototypical (immigrant, bilingual) Americans, to be boldly strategic performative utterances: They attempt to align with certain assumptions and discourses about America that, while historically powerful were themselves under attack in mid-1990's. As I showed in the media section, hegemonic media constructions of the American socio-political landscape at the time portrayed immigrants negatively across the board, and Mexican and Spanish speaking immigrants in especially disparaging terms. Regardless of the facts that much of America used to be Mexico, that immigrants

have been coming to what is now the US for centuries, and regardless of the historically popular image of America as an "immigrant nation," *these* immigrants were constructed in mainstream media and politics as “alien,” “un-American” invaders. This bred an atmosphere that was quite hostile to communities seen as linguistically, culturally and nationally different from the (white) monolingual middle-class. The ideal "America" according to campaigns to limit immigration, to implement Proposition 187, and to enact English Only laws continued to be a monolingual melting pot where all newcomers were expected to drop their native languages (at least in public and in school) and assimilate. Hence, in aligning themselves with images of America as the multilingual land of immigrants, these school community members seemed to strategically bypass the fact that the image itself was controversial.

Where should "we" go from here? Local agendas and connections to national discourses on the "Latino/bilingual" side

Given the state of affairs as they were described to me, almost all “Latino/bilingual” school community members staked out a fractured agenda. They argued that the bilingual program needed to be improved and expanded. However, their vision was one of providing better bilingual instruction *only* for the school’s Latino English Learners. Most expressed it like this teacher:

> America is changing and a bilingual program will adapt them for changes we’re moving into. Many of our kids are coming from behind, with no English, but bilingualism is the economic passport to future success in the US. We prepare them for college, for professions.

When I mentioned the other side's desire for a dual language program he responded, "Bilingual ed for Black students, too? No, Latino students need that special extra edge. There's already enough out there for English speakers. "

I found a delicately balanced double focus in this position. On the one hand, in keeping with hegemonic media representations of bilingual education debates, bilingual

instruction was constructed as a way to bring Latino English Learners up to a level (English-speaking) playing field. It was seen a way to help them master the dominant code they lacked to enable them to enter the "mainstream." This lent consistency to constructions of America as a monolingual English speaking nation, which made bilingual instruction unnecessary for African-Americans who already possessed the valued competency of English. On the other hand, this position challenged hegemonic anti-bilingual education rhetoric by positing biliteracy as a potent advantage in the prestigious public spheres of higher education and the professional job market. This called on constructions of America as part of a global, multilingual community.

I understood this second focus to have a sort of "niche" logic to it. While biliterates a would have advantages over monolinguals in these prestigious public spheres, these advantages were not seen as unfair. The argument was that they would create for Latinos a secure niche in the emerging international economy. This niche would coexist along with what were seen as the already (overly) numerous spaces of opportunity in the public sphere for African-Americans and other English speaking people. It seemed, therefore, not at all contradictory or unfair to champion the value of bilingual education and then struggle to limit access to it (see Valdés, G. 1997 for an elaboration of this argument).

Another teacher expressed a more culturally-based, radical opinion that a few others on campus shared. He argued that bilingual education for Latinos was appropriate because Spanish was naturally *theirs* (and, by extension, it was not naturally African-Americans'):

> I don't care who you are, if you have no roots anything can knock you over. So this program teaches kids about their culture, about themselves, through language. I wouldn't worry so much about transitioning [to English]. They'll get there. We need to give the kids the cultural tools first, then worry about transitioning. English is a nice language but give me what's mine. Then I'll succeed.

Whose knowledge is of most worth?

This agenda for bilingual education as biliteracy and cultural awareness for *only* Latino students lead to a very clear description of the knowledge appropriate for educators. First, most asserted like this teacher, that, “We need educators who are native speakers or really strong in the language and the culture.” Second, educators needed “the latest training” in the philosophical and pedagogical foundations of bilingual instruction--the kind of training, some added, provided for new (at South Central, this meant mostly Latino) teachers by the LAUSD’s District Intern program. This training, along with the oft-mentioned “energy and dedication of new teachers,” was contrasted by many with that of the supposedly pedagogically "out-of-date" “old guard from the seventies." This "old guard" was described to me as the "older Black teachers," the majority of whom were trained in traditional university education programs. And deeper than particular training programs, some staff members put it like this TA who said, simply:

> When one EO teacher said she could teach a bilingual class I said, ‘No you can’t. You don’t speak Spanish.’ She said, ‘With a few years of teaching in a bilingual class we can pick up Spanish. You only need to know a few phrases.’ A few phrases! With little kids! Is she serious? [groan] If they just knew two languages they’d agree with us.

Like those on the "African-Americans/EO" side who felt that, "if they just considered professionalism over language ability" we could get along, those on the "Latino/bilingual" side tended to feel that, "If they just knew two languages we could get along."

These opposing views of the situation, of "where to go from here" and of appropriate knowledge for educators were presented to me by most school committee members on both sides as neatly defined and mutually exclusive. But the more I pondered these aspects of the "Black-Brown war" at South Central Elementary, the more I considered Rosaldo's (1994) reminder that to understand struggles for cultural citizenship we must consider not only the contexts people struggle within but *whose*

voices we consider in our examination of key cultural artifacts. A quote by Toni Morrison came to mind: "Certain absences are so stressed, so ornate... [that]... they call attention to themselves" (1989: 11, cited in Pinar 1993: 67).

There were white school community members on both sides--seventeen in 1996, in fact. So, just where were they?

"Where do white people fit into the "war"?

From the inception of my project I had planned to investigate this question. After all I am white and had been pushed into anthropology by my own drive to better understand where I fit in to the politics surrounding the program in which I taught. Having also heard about the black face incident before beginning research, I began my ethnographic inquiry sure that I would hear talk about white/ness. I couldn't have been more wrong. White people would enter into stories, but their statements and actions were seen as things the "Latino/bilingual" side did or things the "African-American-EO" side said, depending upon which program they taught in. White people were, in a contradictory and troubling way, both very present and very invisible.

For example, as mentioned, a white bilingual teacher, Scott, said at a meeting about the school's discipline problems, "I don't have any behavior problems in my class because my kids are all Hispanic." This infuriated "African-American/EO" school community members, while most "Latino/bilingual" staff members chalked the remark up to his harmless "naiveté" about race relations. People on both sides characterized the comments like Scott's as examples of how this "race thing" had "bilinguals and EO's at each others' throats!" Another example was the black face incident. Scott (again), the teacher who painted the students' faces black, was white, and the teacher who ushered the students on stage (the last gatekeeper of propriety for the performance) was white. Yet, when people summarized the event they called it, "a perfect example of this Black-Brown conflict."

When I asked Latino and African-American school community members, “Where do white people fit in this conflict?” Some replied like Michael: “It’s an African-American/Latino thing. There’s natural groups. The older black teachers in a click, the Latino teachers, the white teachers--no, not the white teachers. They don’t really have a click. Hmmm, no I guess not the white teachers.” I.e. white teachers were simply outside the conflict. Laughed one educational aide, "White people? Oh, they run for cover!" I.e. white people put themselves outside the conflict, and that’s OK. And some replied like this TA: "White people? They can kind of go between the sides, see both sides, try to help everybody." I.e. white people were above the conflict.

Such characterizations of the conflict could be seen to endorse, to co-construct white school community members’ claims to remove. They absolved white people of complicity and excused them from any investment in the destructive dynamics that engulfed the community. Extrapolating is to a national context, this could be seen to bolster hegemonic assumptions that white people have no stake in the construction or maintenance of racialized systems of privilege and marginalization in this country.

As mentioned in the introductory chapter, many scholars interrogate the privileged subject position of white people in the US and the systems that uphold it (Roediger 1991; Morrison 1992; MacCannel 1992; hooks 1992; Strong 1992; Frankenberg 1993; Almaguer 1994; Peller 1995; Harris 1995; Hartigan 1997; Fine, Weis, Addelston, and Marusza 1997; Fine et al. 1997; Sleeter 1993; Rosenberg 1997, Ladson Billings 1998, West 1990, 1994, Delgado and Stefanic 1995). Some scholars show how the category of white/ness has been arduously formulated and maintained in opposition to different racial categories throughout American history; empty, unfilled, defined through "otherness" (Frankenberg 1991; Roediger 1991; Fine 1997; Roman 1993, Sleeter 1993; Winant 1997). Others expose it has a political category engorged with naturalized positive attributes; a normalized metonym for “mainstream America" (Winant 1997: 40; Frankenberg 1993: 158; Williams 1989: 439; Alba 1990), exemplifying the values of neutrality, fairness, and rational restraint (MacCannell 1992: 130, 131), and serving as a kind of sociopolitical resource or property (Harris 1995). I take the middle road, viewing

white/ness a hybridity (Frankenberg 1993): Not solely formed in hollow opposition nor alone stuffed with significance, what white “is” and what that “means” are complex formations, shaped in conflict (Dominguez 1986, Strong 1992, Almaguer 1994).

While these analytical and political moves are imperative, a limitation I find in much of the whiteness literature is that whiteness is conceptualized as *only* a subject position and structure of privilege for phenotypically white people. Further, the whiteness of white people is placed in binary, "oppressor/oppressed" opposition to racialized Others, usually African-Americans or a flattened “people of color." These limitations lend themselves to a very simplistic interpretation of racial dynamics.

Ellsworth (1997) urges us to examine how "white" positionalities and discourses are used by and for white people, *and how they are alternately performed, constructed, inhabited and employed “by actors in a range of subject positions*" (267, italics mine). As such we can track the *myriad* ways in which white/ness operates “in and between” our social institutions and subject positions (MacCannell 1992: 131), illuminating articulations between race as an enduring category of experience and the fluid scope and locations of racial meanings, power and privilege (Dominguez 1986, Fanon 1967).

In doing so we explore Gilroy's (1987) important point that hegemonic ideology “is not the exclusive property” of that perceived as “the hegemonic.” It’s “underlying assumptions” are often “duplicate[d] in precise detail” by those in non-dominant or even explicitly “counterhegemonic” positions (64,40). Hall (1988) urges that we take a fine-grained look at the polyvocal logics of actors in actual struggle (56): What determines the “fractured” agendas espoused by particular interpretive communities; their lines of discursive appropriation, diffusion and rearticulation (56)?

So, just where did white/ness fit into "Black vs. Brown"?

"These people have a hard time getting along!": Constructions of white school community members' subject positions

The following quotes exemplified the ways in which many white school community members responded when I asked, "What changes have you seen at South Central Elementary recently?" One EO teacher said,

> OK there's this debate now between the LEP and the EO. Well the thing is, I even have Janice, who is Afro-American, who knows that I'm the only one in the school who's taught both bilingual and EO... I hear both groups and I've tried to push us towards reconciliation. We are both trying to do the same thing, and that is teach the children to be successful... And I've also seen that another thing that prevents that is the overload of crap. If you do everything they say in bilingual and multicultural studies literature you will end up with overexposed, illiterate children...which only allows me in the fifth grade to receive students who may know who George Washington Carver is, but they don't know who George Washington is. They may know who Father Castillo is but they still don't know who Thomas Jefferson is... Now I have a copy of a letter from somebody in my family who fought in the Revolutionary War, and his description of it is very close to what the older books that I studied said. And so, this is a first person account, [and] people in this day and age want to go back and say, 'Oh no, what they really were doing was *X*.' and they don't have any business doing that.

The bilingual teacher who had been the stage manager during the black face incident provided these reflections on events:

> Recently a bilingual teacher, during, what *was* it--the Black American, African, Afro-American History Month program, he had his kids paint their faces black... and I'm at the door letting people on stage and I see this. And *I* wasn't going to be the one to say, 'You guys can't not go on now.' They were already late as it was. So I said, 'OK you wanna do that, let's go, let 'em go!' I mean I've been dragged into this. Someone said if a person says they don't see color they're lying. Well I felt bad because I don't! But I'm naive. It's hard for me because my Latino kids think they're white! But I don't want to say, 'You're not white, you're not like me,' because that would just put them down. If they think they're white and all that connotates for them, fine... I don't feel like I fit in, because I'm not for EO because I'm not Black and I'm not for bilingual because I don't speak Spanish. I just found out last year that there is racial strife on the staff! Then I realized, these people have a hard time getting along. It [the black face incident]

> may have nothing to do with bilingual education but it comes up. I think it's their self-confidence getting in the way there. Every time bilingual education is mentioned this will pop up and it gets exacerbated... But I'm limited to my classroom, so I stay out of other people's crap.

Here we see white school community members employing characterizations found to be common in white discourses about race and politics: White people are mediators above the "crap" of racial conflict and cultural agendas; they are the keepers of the flame of "true" American history, a position legitimized through bloodlines; they are the rational time keepers during the black face incident; they are blind to and naive of race. They portrayed claims of racism as individual "self-confidence" problems. These discourses can be seen to have the effect of avoiding talk of race or complicity with racism through the use of the trope of color blindness (Frankenberg 1993; Peller 1995), assuming that to notice color is therefore to *be* racist (Almaguer 1994 and Frankenberg 1993) (this, when they quite clearly saw race--enough to claim that their Latino students "aren't white like me"); and of individualizing and psychologizing race/ism.

And like their African-American and Latino counterparts, these white school community members conflated ideas of language, nation, culture and race in performative utterances that forwarded a particular version of the issues. Though it was implicit, in the first excerpt this person posited the "Latino/bilingual" and "African-American/EO" multicultural curricular-policy agendas as cultural "crap." Yet he himself espoused a deeply cultural-political agenda for the (history) curriculum, based on his ancestry going back to the formative period of the nation state. And, these white people did not "fit in" to either the "African-American/EO" or "Latino/bilingual" side, it seemed, because they did not "fit" in either tightly-woven nexus of race/language. Somehow they could not *be* on either side as Latinos and African-Americans *were* on their sides. Lending consistency to hegemonic media typifications of how racial issues operate, they portrayed this debate as only involving the African-American and Latino school community members.

I myself was another example. While there was no open school wide “war” about bilingual education during my early years as a teacher at South Central Elementary, as I mentioned in introduction some of the issues of cultural citizenship hotly contested in 1996 were already beginning to surface at that time. In the following excerpt from my field notes I reflected on my early days as a teacher at South Central Elementary in light of what I was learning through research:

> I remember my first faculty meeting. We had to establish our after-school tutoring [UCTP—discussed in the post-227 chapter] schedule for the year. A few teachers, I remember some of them being African-American, announced their desire to tutor on Tuesdays and Thursdays. I became concerned. If we tutored on Tuesdays and Thursdays, we District Interns might not be able to get to our Thursday afternoon classes on time. I raised my hand and explained this. One African-American teacher stood up and objected to tailoring the tutoring schedule just to fit the DI' s schedule. The principal responded, “Well, when I hired these Interns I made a commitment to them so I can’t require that they do something that conflicts with their classes.” And with that the discussion was closed. What sticks with me about this moment is the frustration I sensed afterwards from many teachers, and how closed my perspective was about what had just gone on. I did not realize that this decision became, for many, another in an accumulating list of unfair special treatment for “bilingual people.” In fact I didn’t even bother to wonder. It was like I kept my eyes closed to the political implications of my actions. I most definitely needed to engage in more critical thought and dialogue about my positionality in, and the "hot issues" of, local dynamics. If I had done this I would have seen why what I said might invite resentment. I would have approached the issue differently. ... Is my perspective still oblivious to the dynamics I am implicated in? Probably... but as much as back then? I don't think so, I hope not.

I knew at the outset of my research that I would be confronted with things about myself in relation to this "war" at South Central Elementary. This didn't make them any easier to face, though. As an anthropologist I hoped that by confronting my positionality I could become more critically aware of, sensitive to, and proactive in the complex dynamics of cultural citizenship that I studied. I also hoped that by exposing myself I could tip my readers off to the limitations/potential biases of my analysis. When listening to other white people position themselves through discourses of naiveté about

race and politics I had always assumed that those discourses were to some extent cover-ups for racist assumptions that they "*must* have known" they harbored. But here I am reflecting back on my *own* actions and constructions of myself, sounding like other white folks I was quoting. Naiveté, color blindness, disengagement, disconnection, being above it, being a mediator, holding a truer key to the "American" past, none of it holds water when we think about our real participation in everyday life in our community. There was not yet an all-out "war" in 1992 but I show myself here to have been just as much a contributor as any other school community member to the tensions that exploded in 1996. We, and the dynamics of privilege and disenfranchisement woven into whiteness in this country, are not separate from but thickly braided into conflicts over cultural citizenship. Perceptions of and struggles over equity, voice, belonging, value, and access are experienced and constructed *in, through and between* all racial (and linguistic and national and class, etc.) identity and political categories.

I never voiced in a public format (like a faculty meeting) at that time my vision for bilingual education vis-à-vis Latino and African-American students, although I did with friends and colleagues in smaller settings. I supported (and still support) the agenda of dual language bilingual education. Smitherman (2002) expresses it powerfully in her three-pronged agenda for language researchers, activists and policy makers: First, reinforce the teaching of the language of wider communication (here, Standard English); second, reinforce and reaffirm the legitimacy of non-mainstream languages and dialects in communities and schools; third, promote the acquisition of foreign languages by all, particularly Spanish because of its widespread use in this hemisphere. This, Darder (1997) agrees, would "empower the marginalized [and] encourage multidialectal understanding," enabling a coalitional politics of "cross-linguistic and cross-cultural dialogues" to create a *joint* "voice" against the monolingual hegemonic norm (336)—a voice I, too, could have sung with had I been more reflective, critical and activist in my thinking about dynamics in my school community.

I and other white people were not the only ones to express the kinds of discourses I explore here, however. On several occasions during my research African-American and

Latino school community members expressed attitudes and employed discourses that have generally been considered in the literature to be "white." I believe that this speaks to intersecting, mutually-constitutive structures of access, agency and determination that we all negotiate. I think it speaks to how aspects of African-American, white, Latino, monolingual, and bilingual positionalities in the local and national arenas are "constantly crossed and recrossed" (Hall 1996: 444).

"They think they're white!": Latinos and African-Americans strategically deploy whiteness

Recent ethnographies of race and education have examined the phenomenon of individuals of color "acting white" in order to draw on specific systems of access, cultural capital, legitimacy, and privilege in the (white) "mainstream" public sphere (e.g. Fordham 1996; Urciuoli 1996; Foley 1990). In these ethnographies "whiteness" becomes a metacommunicative symbol or dynamic, a place marker for a complex set of highly-charged discursive and material practices. At a few moments in my explorations of struggles for cultural citizenship at South Central Elementary, Latino and African-American school community members could be seen to strategically deploy these discourses and practices--tapping the privilege and legitimacy accorded them by "mainstream" society--in order to bolster their own position in the conflict. And on can meanone occasion, below, someone accused others of "acting white," of behaving in negative ways assigned to white/ness. In response to my question, "How would you characterize the conflict?" one Latina TA talked about the paraprofessional staff meetings (attended only by Latino TAs and African-American Educational Aides):

> If you walk into meetings you see Black and White divided. But I get along with everybody. I interact with all of them. I tend to lean more to their side ["African-American/EO"] so they don't think I'm over there [with the "white"]. There is division ever since I've been here. Some African-Americans are instigators... I think they feel like that because they see me and other TA's stay later working on things, festivals. I don't know why they don't stay or do. I think that's what it is.

> But I'm divided in both camps. But I feel some of these issues need to be put behind us.

The first thing that struck me about this was the fact that she characterized the division as "Black and white." This was one of only three times that summer that *anyone* did so. She then constructed herself as on the white side and as the neutral intermediary amidst the chaos. She seemed to claim a space of remove, able to pass "ideal objective judgment" (MacCannell 1992:130) on the situation, championing an up-by-your-bootstraps rationale for how "African-American/EO" instigators could resolve their individual complaints: by working hard like she does.

In a twist on the above claim to white/ness, one African-American parent assigned her new Latino neighbors to the category based on their behavior. She explained to me that she was so frustrated with this school and this neighborhood that she was about to move: "They run around, all those kids, and I can't talk to 'em. They're loud oneand they knock over my stuff and use my barbecue. They think they're white!" This contradicts the simple "Black-Brown" and "oppressor/oppressed" representations of school community dynamics that most people offered me, indicating a multifaceted system of privilege, symbolized by white vs. Black but acted out by Brown vs. Black and vs. white.

In a particularly emotional interview, Janice told me, "We have a race problem here, it's like a hate." Then she added, "But you do have a lot of wonderful Latino people here. I don't look at color. I have a lot of white friends, Mexican friends. This isn't about color. It's about bilingual versus EO." Similar to accounts of white people employing discourse of color blindness, I interpreted this as a move to preempt an accusation of a racial bias on her part (as if "looking" at race herself would mark her as rac*ist*), given that that many other moments Janice had explicitly assigned to culpability for the conflict on Latinos.

Another example of deployments of theoretically "white" attitudes and discourses was the application of culture of poverty discourse, discussed earlier. All of the opinions about culture shared earlier in this chapter were quotes from school community members

who were African-American or Latino. Historically, culture of poverty discourses have been wielded by white scholars to naturalize the oppression of racialized Others. These groups have been portrayed as culturally inferior to "mainstream Americans" (as gloss for white middle class) and as such, as "causing their own problems" and those of the nation. Here, discursive white/ness was "linked" *to and through* "other colors" (Fine1997:58); variously employed by people in a range of subject positions: The culture of poverty theory was strategically deployed to construct Latinos and African-Americans as superior/inferior to each other in relation to the dominant sector. while I saw these moves as attempts to garner legitimacy and advantage for one side's positions in the local conflict, they could be seen to lend consistency to the larger, institutional systems of racial-class oppression and inequity that people were trying to challenge through the educational agendas they championed for "their" group.

Reflections on policy: the power of ch(v)oice in cultural citizenship

As we explore both sides' descriptions of the "war," their proposed terms for truce, and dynamics of white/ness, a few key points arise that may help educators, parents, researchers and policymakers better understand the complexities of policy processes in school communities and more effectively address struggles for equity and cultural citizenship.

First, both interpretive communities, "Latino/bilingual" and "African-American/EO," could be seen striving for legitimacy in both the local and national contexts. As Rosaldo (1994) and Flores and Benmayor (1997) argue, to understand how and why people construct their struggles for cultural citizenship we must explore the vernacular/local *and* the national arenas as concomitant spaces of experience and negotiation of advantageous places to "stand" (hooks 2000)—and the foothold can be comprised of various requirements, from material things to a feeling of belonging to voice in decision making processes, to professional value, etc.. This is key, I believe, to understanding politics of cultural citizenship at South Central Elementary.

This was a time of great change. In the local context there was the ongoing demographic shift and the programmatic move to a larger and larger bilingual program. This brought the attendant dynamics and perceptions of inclusion/exclusion, favoritism, racism, greed, lack of professionalism, competition and disharmony that I have described. At the same time there was the shift to the new LEARN organizational model, which left the protocols and accountability of decision-making unclear to many, and the serial changes of administration (there had been four principals in the last two years, seesawing from a perceived "pro-bilingual" to "pro-EO" to "pro-bilingual"). As mentioned in the media section, at the state level the Board of Education was softening the previously strict bilingual education mandates. In accordance with this LAUSD's revised 1996 Master Plan for English Learners (the District's bilingual education guide) relaxed the previously tightly proscribed ways in which schools could structure programs and instruction to meet the needs of English Learners (Los Angeles Unified School District1996c). Under the plan, school communities could now choose from several different models of bilingual education or opt out all together: If they felt that the programs outlined in the Plan did "not meet the needs of the school population," a "school designed program" could be submitted to the Division of Instruction for approval (53).

On a national scale there was cultural change due to high levels of immigration, and virulent public debates about these changes and their import for schools and the nation. School community members both drew upon and challenged politically-charged, symbolic media discourses about immigrants, race, English and Spanish, and fairness and opportunity within strategically constructed--and flexible--ideals of "America" as they staked their claim to legitimacy in the community and to justify policy agendas.

Second, as Levinson and Holland (1996) remind us, we must keep in mind the constitutive, interwoven forces of structure and agency (3) as we seek to understand life in schools. It seemed to me that at this time *feelings of possibility* helped to fan the flames of this conflict so high. The intertwined forces of structure and agency seemed to be in a state of flux where much was up for grabs. I do not mean to imply that it felt like a

"free for all" on campus at that time, but the uncertainty within change seemed to imbue a certain sense of *space for agency* in people's negotiations of the political terrain: If the administration changed again, if demographic shifts quickened or reversed a little, if locally enough people from one side or the other sat on the right decision-making committee or if nationally enough people raised their voices in the choice of one agenda or the other, either side might "win"--either side might find a foothold towards more stable, fertile ground for nurturing wider access (for themselves) to the fruit of full cultural citizenship.

Third, the competing interpretive communities in this conflict were in practice quite heterogeneous within and between. "African-American/EO vs. Latino/bilingual" just did not capture all that was going on. Many borders were crossed in this supposedly clear-cut conflict. People crossed lines racially and linguistically, and though I found a general consensus on either side about experiences of school politics and agendas for the future, there was by no means unanimity. And, white people and dynamics of whiteness played key, though largely unacknowledged roles in the “Black/Brown" conflict.

I argue that what must be questioned is *not* that people organized the world through racial categories. These constructed racial perimeters gave shape and momentum to each set of discourses and agendas. What we must wonder about together as school community members, researchers and policymakers (what I have begun to ponder in this document), is why, how and to what effect these racial categories *mapped so easily to language and then to played so well into* assumptions about nation and structures of privilege and marginalization in the local and national arenas. Untangling the categories of language, race, and nation is key, I believe, to seeing how these structures of domination are maintained and how our own discourses and actions contribute to this. Leaving them unexamined can neutralize the potential for people to coalesce around strategic aspects of their multifaceted subject positions in the name of shared goals.

Of course just "seeing common bonds" would not have dissolved lines of difference and conflict. However I believe that questioning our often pessimistic sensibilities about who is "us" and who is "them," and about the potential of coalition, is

crucial to a counterhegemonic politics that was sorely needed by the mid-1990s (and that still is). For example in the LAUSD itself, African-American students were categorized in the 1996 Master Plan for English Learners as "language different" in relation to Mainstream American English speakers. They were considered as "English Learners" in need of special instruction to increase fluency in Mainstream American English (Los Angeles Unified School District 1996c; now they are termed SEL's—Standard English Learners). And I agree that many Black students as well as Chicano and other students who come to school speaking nonstandard varieties of English do need explicit instruction on Standard English and code switching to increase the forms of cultural-literacy capital that they can utilize, to open academic and social doors while honoring the value their home language/s. As Smitherman (1992, 2002), Darder (1997) and Attinasi (1997) have pointed out, the English Only movement that gained steam in the mid-1990s against bilingual education had implications not only for Latino supporters of Spanish-English bilingual education. These efforts to narrow, standardize and monitor the language to be considered "correct," officially "American," and to legislate it as solely proper for use in schools and public places now more than ever had implications for African-Americans and other linguistic minorities as well. Indeed, aspects of Latino and African-American positionalities international arena are "constantly crossed and recrossed" (Hall 1996: 444).

United around the goal of dual language bilingual education, South Central Elementary could have forged a new local definition of the properly educated person (Levinson, Foley and Holland 1996). This person would be biliterate as well as culturally knowledgeable of self, and supportive of a diversified "mainstream." In concert with other communities implementing dual language bilingual programs, this definition might have had the potential to make an impact on a national scale—to talk back to national-level discourses about what it is to be well educated in America , about what constitutes the terrain for solidarities and the values of diversity (Rosaldo 1994; see also Hale 1994; Haraway 1988; LaClau and Mouffe 1984). I believe that this could have, in part, addressed the concerns some "Latino/bilingual" school community members saw with

including African-Americans in the bilingual program. Though it is a complicated dynamic that needs to be thoroughly addressed (Valdés, G. 1997), it is possible that if bilingualism were more widely valued and aspired to there would be an enormous arena instead of a small "niche" that Latino and other bilinguals would be able to fill. While there would be more competition there would also be a much wider field.

More, I argue that white school community members and white people nation-wide also had (and have) a stake in these solidarities; a node in the crisscross of cultural, political and material positionalities and ideals. Many white people feared the rising tide of extreme conservatism in the English Only movement at the time. We, too, saw threats to bilingualism as threats to the internal diversity of our own subject positions and visions for society. And while whites garner the most benefit from current systems of privilege in the US, large numbers within this privileged sphere do occupy subject positions that are marked. Whether working class, physically challenged, woman, gay, or otherwise Other, many do not make a perfect match for the stereotypical white, middle-class male American, and often live relatively less-charmed lives because of it. We *all* have a stake--no matter what color or background--in creating a society where all groups and all individuals are academically and socially prepared to be high-performing contributors to strong, inclusive communities and to successful, productive economies. We *all* benefit from access to more kinds of spaces in which to construct and enact our different subjectivities--our different paths to contribution other than that assigned by the hegemonic.

Towards 1998

I left Los Angeles again for Austin in the fall of 1996. The school community was, by all accounts, in turmoil. Morale was low, misunderstanding and discord was high. And student achievement suffered for it. I hoped that the scholarly analyses I planned to produce about this "war" would contribute to understandings of the dynamics of cultural citizenship in times of change in American schools. I believed I had a

particularly relevant case to share, as South Central Elementary was experiencing the kinds of changes predicted to happen nationwide in the coming years.

This case became even more fascinating and important by 1998. Not only was the entire nation now experiencing the kinds of changes and tensions we felt in our school community in 1996, but California led the reinvigorated English Only movement when it passed the “English For the Children” Proposition 227. In 1998 I would have the opportunity to tell the story of South Central Elementary's journey--our journey, my journey--through the implementation of his infamous bell-whether educational language policy. *And* perhaps most interestingly, I would have the chance to trace, explore and account for politics of cultural citizenship when the supposed main issue in dispute, the center of attention--the bilingual program--was to a large extent removed. What would happen to this "war" that was described with conjoined, conflated racial and linguistic/programmatic descriptors ("African-American/EO," "Latino/bilingual") when the most controversial descriptor--bilingual--was outlawed? What would this tell us about how people understand and construct the ingredients and parameters of cultural citizenship?

CHAPTER 4 THE POST-227 TERRAIN: MEDIA DISCOURSES LEADING UP TO AND FOLLOWING IMPLEMENTATION

The larger context for 227: politics and discourses about demographic and culture shifts

The questions and controversies of the mid-1990s gained intensity in the later years of the decade in national politics and in the media. More and more reporters, politicians and pundits alike asked, Who are "we" as a nation? and, What will America look like and be like in the 21st century? (McDonnell 1996, Morganthau 1997). We were told that the coming millennium would bring a "new face" to America (Morganthau 1997). Statistics abounded predicting America's metamorphosis: By the year 2025 whites would no longer be the demographic majority. Most notably, by then the Latino population was expected to top 25 % (Morganthau 1997: 59), and the population of non-English speaking people was burgeoning. Census Bureau data indicated that between 1993 and 2000, non-English speaking students in public schools increased by 105% (National Education Association 2003: 15). Headlines such as, "Welcome to Amexica: The border is vanishing before our eyes, creating a new world for all of us" (Time cover page, June 2001) were common. Article after article debated the implications of this coming transformation of America into a "cafe au lait" society.

California was cited as the place these changes had begun to occur first and most dramatically. The state received a full one fourth of the nation's immigrants and was estimated to be the destination of over 40% of all illegal immigrants. It was predicted to have a population comprised of at least half Latino by as early as 2040 (Lesher 1999). Latinos were expected to make up 25% of the state's legislators even sooner (Balotta 2000). Statements such as, "Shift in the Mix Alters the Face of California" (Purdum 2000) screamed from headlines. California, we were told, would be "by far the largest proving ground for what it may eventually be like to live in a United States in which no one racial or ethnic group predominates [demographically]" (Purdum 2000: A12).

Californians were urged to ask “who ‘we’ are” because we were “synthesizing a new hybrid American culture” (Rodriguez, G. 1998: 30).

Los Angeles, named America's "world city," was further singled out as a place where tomorrow's population changes could be seen today (Pape 1999: 26). Latinos were already close to 50% of the L.A. County population at the time (Sterngold 2000). Between 1980 and 1990 the total population of Los Angeles County grew by 1.38 million residents, of which 1.24 million, or 90%, were Latinos (and many of whom were immigrants) (Rocco 1997:103). Pertinent to this project, it is notable that in the same time the African-American population of L.A. only increased by 20,000 (103). In this way Los Angeles and California more generally continued to be the spark for competing imaginations of the evolving American national "community.”

Those who saw these local and national transformations as beneficial told stories about how, for example, immigrant janitors and hotel workers energized the union movement and created a "new language of American labor" (Verhovek 1999: A8). They reported that Latino immigrants "chang[ed] the face" of religion, invigorating shrinking Catholic parishes nationwide (Niebuhr 1999). They told us about recent graduates from an L.A. High School who were creating, "Journeys Into the New Los Angeles" (Lopez and Connell 2000).

By 1999 it was an acknowledged fact by all political sectors that immigration both legal and illegal was fueling the nation's economic boom. Immigrants filled jobs that other American workers would not, particularly in such difficult industries as agriculture and meat processing. The payroll and sales taxes they paid provided valuable monies for state and federal coffers. The presence of large numbers of immigrants alone was reported to be enlivening withering populations throughout the heartlands and industries nationwide (Regalia 1999, [No author listed] 1999). Latino immigrants in particular were being hailed as "the new American Dream Makers" (Hayes-Bautista 2000:B5).

Citing this, many powerful governmental and non-governmental institutions that were traditionally opposed to open immigration began to adopt pro-immigration stances,

and even pro-illegal immigration tolerances, indicating that “illegal immigration [was]n’t even anywhere near” the hot-button cultural issue it was but a few years previous (Rodriguez, G. 1998: 30). For example, Alan Greenspan at the Fed officially lobbied for the further opening of national borders to immigration. The AFL-CIO reversed its long-time anti-immigration stance in order to support better treatment of immigrant workers, legal and illegal (Medina 2000). Even the INS, while publicly championing its fortifications of the U.S.-Mexico border, indirectly encouraged immigration by largely turning a friendly blind eye to businesses that employed illegal immigrants (Uchitelle 2000).

Politicians took note of the increasingly numerous and powerful Latino/immigrant population: We read about a surprising new alliance between Democrats, Republicans, and religious communities that urged the easing of immigration laws (Greenhouse 2000). In 2000 Senators Reid of Nevada and Kennedy of Massachusetts pushed for federal legislation to allow undocumented immigrants an easier path to citizenship (Reid 2000). Both Republican and Democratic 2000 presidential candidates took pro-immigration positions and made more efforts than ever before to woo Latino voters (Linares 2000). State and county governments, particularly in the Midwest, launched media campaigns and municipal programs to attract immigrant laborers and families (Regalia 1999, La Opinión News Services 2000 b).

The discourses of these immigration supporters stressed the fact that people came to America in search of what Americans sought: to earn a good living, to give their children a good education, and eventually to settle into the American Dream in places like the "idyllic mountain towns in Montana" (Maharidge 1999). They brought to readers' attention that the desires of immigrants to become citizens and to realize the American Dream actually far outweighed many communities' capacities to provide appropriate assimilationist services such as citizenship classes, English classes, etc. (Leovy 1999). Indeed by most accounts, in the late 1990s a very pro-immigrant atmosphere flourished in the American public sphere.

However this was not without its detractors. By late spring of 1999 California's Governor Gray Davis inherited a sticky situation: The judicial ruling on the declared unconstitutionality of most aspects of the state's 1994 anti-immigration Proposition 187 had been appealed by former Governor Pete Wilson. With Davis now in office, formerly disheartened 187 proponents pressured him to continue on with Wilson's appeal to federal courts. After much debate (see for example Skelton 1999) Davis took Prop 187 to mediation, and through that process the measure that became the defining issue of California politics in the 1990s--and the spark that woke up the, "giant of Latino power" ([my translation] Marrero 1999: 3A.)-- went to its legislative death.

At the same time, competing imaginations of the nation swirled around in the media in the form of continuing anti-immigration discourses. Indeed worldwide, anti-immigration movements were beginning to garner media attention. By late 1999 we began reading about a growing push by anti-immigrant groups in the U.S. for a new and even more stringent Proposition 187 (de la Torre-Jimenez and Botello 1999).

Anti-immigration discourses of this time were strikingly reminiscent of those I discussed in the pre-227 media chapter. A supporter of this movement was quoted in the Los Angeles Times in 1999 as saying that, "People know that illegal immigration is more out of control than ever and that illegal aliens continue to receive taxpayer-funded benefits... [S]upport for Prop 187 is just a strong as it was in 1994. Illegal immigration [is] a crime" and an even more extreme version of prop 187 “is a certainty” (Keeler 1999: B 8). "The cactus wall has fallen," (Rodriguez, R. 2000: M1) we were told, and we must, "cut immigration now" (Collard 1999: A. 18).

Immigration foes charged immigrants with all manner of transgressions. For example, they charged that immigrants were (figuratively and literally) "identity thieves,” stealing law-abiding citizens' Social Security numbers and lives (Kirby 2000: B6). They further warned that immigrants brought "rampant" tuberculosis to the U.S. (Sachs 2000); and that they caused smog, over-crowding and the loss of valuable wilderness (Grober 2000). Immigrants' presence engendered increased social conflict (Silverstein 2000) and an ever-threatening intra-national balkanization (Clough 1997: M1). This was dangerous,

we were told, "because this threatens the power of national authorities" (Clough 1997: M1). And as immigrants infiltrated schools, towns, and workers' unions nationwide, they and their Spanish language "conquered" other treasured "American" (read: English language) cultural institutions, such as radio stations (Tobar 2000: A 1).

Akin to Balibar's explanation of the "immigration complex" (1991), Urciuoli (1997) called such concern with linguistic and cultural "invasion" the "flip side of U.S. involvement in globalized economic processes" (1). Immigrants, morphed in popular discourses into a mass of "Hispanics/Latinos," were characterized as an illicit-nation-within-the-legitimate-nation" (Urciuoli 1997: 3), to be fended off by "true Americans" with the proposed "uniting device" of English (5).

More and more municipalities and states began to push for legislation to forbid languages other than English for official business--even where simultaneously they were begging immigrants to populate their towns and fill their jobs (Iowa, for example) (Niebuhr 1999)! Some businesses even forbid workers who were hired for their bilingual skills from speaking Spanish during personal break times (Girion 2000). Treatment of immigrants and suspected illegal immigrants was reported as increasingly harsh. Victims of an increasing INS "inhumanity" often turned out to be falsely-accused American citizens by birth, caught and harassed for, "being Brown near the border" (Lewis 1999: A 31). By 1999 it was even suggested by broad, vocal political coalitions that the vicious "hunting" of illegal border crossers be studied by the U.N. (Amador 2000: 1 B.) During the 2000 presidential campaign the nativist, English Only bent of Pat Buchanan's Reform Party candidacy attracted much media attention with its controversial TV ads that featured a white man sitting at his table eating spaghetti. He begins to choke on a meatball when he hears on his television that, "Today English lost its place as the official language of the United States of America." When he picks up the phone and dials 911 he has to listen to a long recording requesting, "Choose your language--Spanish, Korean...." Then the television ad says (to paraphrase), "Are you tired of English losing its place in America?…" In many ways language could be seen as laminated to the biological part of race and articulated to nation, "Good English" standing in for whiteness and

Americanness (Urciuoli 1997: 8), Spanish standing in for Brownness and Other. This, even as we were told that to take advantage of the growing, globalizing economy of the time, workers and businesses everywhere needed to be able to serve the nation's increasingly multilingual and multicultural markets (Silverstein 1999, La Opinión News Services 2000a).

It was within these intensifying demographic changes and competing cultural and economic forces that people wondered more and more, "Is this America" (Lewis 1999: A 31)? While anti-immigrationism did not seem to be as "hot button" of an issue as it used to be, it was still alive and kicking. And many people were caught in the "*in-between* spaces through which the meanings of cultural and political authority [and identity] are negotiated" (Bhabha 1994: 4, italics in original): Take for example to states launching public relations campaigns to draw immigrants to populate their dying towns while enacting legislation to make English the official language of the state. People found themselves ambivalent about their answers to the question, What can we do now to create the kind of town or state or nation we want tomorrow? People seemed to be searching for the boundaries and contents of the nation, only to find them slippery and elusive--"crossed, erased, and translated in the process of cultural production" in daily life (4). The nation was indeed being actively imagined, constantly "in narration" (4).

One way to answer the question of how to create a particular kind of "America," Bianco (2003) pointed out, was to highlight again the dynamic duo of Language and Education; to make language--particularly second and foreign languages--"much more strongly than other parts of school curricula, and much more strongly than in the past, [the] subject of discrete policy treatment" (13). In California one way to do that was to campaign for the state's anti-bilingual education "English For The Children" Proposition 227 ballot measure.

The larger context for 227: politics and discourses of race

Around the time of Proposition 227's implementation the topic of race frequently drew media attention. From one perspective portrayed often in headlines, trends in race and equity politics could be seen taking a progressive, inclusive turn. We read about how the world, and particularly the city of Los Angeles, was increasingly multi-racial and multicultural. Hence, the old black/white model of race relations was no longer relevant. Multi-ethnic and -racial coalition building would "be the surest path to political power for a generation to come" (Pape 1999: 26). The utilization and celebration of diversity and coalition building had become the keys to productivity.

More and more communities were like Walnut, California, we were told: "Learning to look past race," the community reveled in its diversity and in creating vibrant schools, businesses and inter-group relations (O'Connor 1999: A 1). More and more cities were like Houston, where coalition building between Black, Hispanic and Anglo construction businesses was necessary to address stiff contract competition (Navarro 2000). More and more elections were like those in Los Angeles where sets of overlapping community agendas made the dichotomous black/white paradigm (in the words of Franklin Gilliam, a professor of political science at UCLA), "'played out'" (Fears and Olivo 1999: A 31). We read that L.A.'s increasing diversity was in fact, "a welcome opportunity for [the metropolis] to become a genuinely global city.... The 'truth' is that everything important in Los Angeles is perceived increasingly through the prism of race.... A real multiracial, multicultural and multilingual leadership [is necessary] to act as role models to inspire kids..." (Hayden 1999: B 9).

Another set of discourses that also received much media attention portrayed a negative perspective on the trajectory of race relations and equity politics. From this perspective the tide could be seen shifting towards strife and negativity: We read about increasing racial conflict in prisons (neo- Nazi groups were on the rise) (Golab 1999), and in communities nationwide (South Carolinians battled over the future of Confederate banner as the state's official flag) (Buckley 2000). The practice of police racial profiling

also came under scrutiny (Berke 2000). A backlash against Affirmative Action was changing the framework within which industries and institutions did business, according to which school districts implemented busing and attendance policies, and according to which larger and larger segments of society shaped their visions of equity.

Regarding Affirmative Action in schools, we read that (Lewin 1998: A 1), "Nearly a half-century after Brown vs. Board of Education... [Affirmative Action] is becoming a pressing issue, as the desegregation orders imposed by the courts decades ago are lifted in more and more areas," such as in Nashville, Oklahoma City, Denver, Wilmington DE, and Cleveland. In the 1996 Hopwood vs. Texas case, the Fifth United States Circuit Court of Appeals determined that race could not be taken into account in any higher education admissions program. In 1996 California again made national headlines by passing the voter initiative Proposition 209, which outlawed Affirmative Action in business practices as well as in education.

In between these "positive" and "negative" valuations of the increasing diversity of the American ethnoscape, even "well meaning" diversity advocates espoused discourses that equated the U.S.'s increasing diversity with decreasing status: Sen. Tom Hayden (Democrat, Los Angeles), wrote in a Los Angeles Times editorial in 1999 that as the number of Latinos in Los Angeles rose to almost 70%, LAUSD had become, "a poor Third World district in the richest of First World cities. The 'developing country,' in this case, is a new United States that will be multicultural" (Hayden 1999: B 9).

One journalist, discussing the "simmering racial tensions" in the city of Los Angeles (Helfand and Sahagun 1999: A 1) reported that,

Public schools have become the focal point of tensions and conflicts that exist in Los Angeles, particularly the diverse composition racially and ethnically of the city. This has been made evident by the many secondary schools in the city that have exploded with ethnic conflicts during the last five years. Even primary schools... have had their quota of tension and strife (see also Hicks 1999: B 1).

Another reported racially tinged incidents such as "shouting matches between parents and students at several Los Angeles schools, and Inglewood High school's

decision to scrap its traditional observances of Black History Month and Cinco de Mayo because of tensions between black and Latino students" (Sahagun 1999a: B 2). In one highly-publicized incident (interesting in the context of this research for its confluence of race and language politics), an LAUSD elementary school principal was beaten unconscious, a newspaper article reported, "by two men who told him they didn't want him on campus because his white..." The attack, we were told, "may have been related to growing discontent by [the school's majority] Latino parents" over what they perceived as the principal's "efforts to scale back bilingual education" (Blankstein and Luo 1999: B 1, B 8).

…Discourses about Black-Latino relations

As discussed in the pre-227 media chapter, Shah and Thornton (1991) charge that the “typification” of African-American/Latino relations in media discourses has been "extreme" (133). African-American/Latino relations have been presented in the media in an “ahistorical manner” ignorant of historical group experiences (133). This has had the effect of naturalizing the characterization of Latinos and African-Americans as opposing camps, as communities battling each other for resources and jobs. In a popular book entitled, "Black and Brown in America" (1997), Bill Piatt also criticized such typifications, stating that the mainstream media seemed to only portray Black-Latino relations as simplified cases of "in-fighting over crumbs" (89). Little attention is paid, he argued, to the issues that Blacks and Latinos have in common in both local and national politics, and little concern is shown for "presenting stories of successful peacemakers" (10).

When I analyzed my hundreds of media clippings with an eye for how African-Americans and Latinos, and African-American and Latino relations, were presented in this time period, I actually found two distinct sets of discourses. First were a set of discourses like those described by Piatt, characterizing Black-Latino relations as contentious and opposing. For example, about the time that news of Antonio

Villaraigosa's upcoming candidacy for mayor of Los Angeles broke (he would have been the first Latino mayor in many years), we read of increasing "tensions" between Latinos and other groups, particularly African-Americans, over, "battles for jobs, political power and turf" (Sahagun 1999b: A1). Of course these tensions existed around educational issues. Commented one columnist, "Black education in LAUSD in trouble" because "reform must proceed within the Latino-ization of LAUSD," and Black and Latino constituencies had to compete for the District's and for policy reformers' attention (Aubrey 2000: 26). These struggles for policy, fiscal and moral "turf "even spread to the pulpit. One church's struggle with demographic change and cultural clash between Black and Latino parishioners, "reflect[ed] those emerging across Southern California" (Ramirez 1999: A1): Black parishioners were resentful of Latinos "invading" and "laying claim" to their church (A 22).

Second were a set of discourses that tied African-Americans and Latinos together around certain issues: African-American and Latino students were reported to be increasingly segregated *together* in failing schools and denied access to advanced curricula (Staples 1999). After the passage of Proposition 209 in California, the number of Latino and African-American (and other minority) students in the state's higher education system was reported as plummeting. Full-page ads in the New York Times declared that poorly-prepared teachers, overcrowding, segregation, under-funding, and tracking prepared students of color for failure on high school exit exams: "This racially-biased outcome is already evident in Texas. Mexican-American and African-American students make up 40% of all Texas seniors, but they represent 85% of the students who fail the final administration of the Texas high school exit exam each year" (Applied Research Center 1999). And achievement test scores for Black and Latino students in California, we were told, were lagging behind those of White students ([Los Angeles Times editorial, no author listed] 1999: B 8). Housing discrimination was also reported as an issue that persisted for both groups (García-Irigoyen 1999). When taken together with stories about the multi-racial communities and multicultural politics mentioned earlier, it was possible to see a strain of media discourses that, while not listing

"peacemakers" per se, still highlighted points of connection, cooperation and triumphs. This strain was given less air time and ink space, however. It definitely presented an alternate, counterhegemonic view of diversity, race, and African-American /Latino relations than the more common paradigm of competition and conflict.

The larger context for 227: education politics

Debates about 227 sat within these swirling discourses about immigration and the changing face of America, roiling race politics, tensions and connections between African-Americans and Latinos, and *also* within a rising tide of debates about what to do with American schools in general. The era was one of frantic school reform movements nationwide. Plans for how to properly educate the next generation of Americans became so controversial they were often "deal breakers" in congressional budget negotiations (Seelye 1998: A1, also Hastings 2000b) and they ranked as "top priorities" for 2000 presidential candidates (Gerstenzang 2000).

News about such issues as vouchers and charter schools, the rolling back of affirmative action legislation (Lewin 1998), and the poor state of urban and minority education were ubiquitous (Sahagun and Helfand 2000, Ballesteros-Coronel 2000). News about teacher shortages ([no author listed]/Newsweek 2000), teacher training and salaries (Gladstone 1999), school accountability reform (Groves 2000a), federal vs. local control, instructional innovations such as the implementation of academic standards (Steinberg 1999), the return to phonics and debates about structured vs. constructivist curriculums (Morse 2000) flooded national publications. Indeed, news of these controversies and reform efforts came so fast and furious that analysts and academics began to urge that policymakers "take a breather" from mandating more sweeping reforms in order to give schools "a chance to make the existing 'jigsaw puzzle' of mandates work," particularly for public schools' burgeoning numbers of English Learners (Groves 2000: A3, A21).

In the fall of 1998 pollsters found that California voters ranked education as their number one concern (Purdum 1998: A1). The state ranked last in the percentage of young adults who earned high school diplomas and 37th in SAT scores. With its population expected to grow by 18 million (an entire New York State) by the year 2025, people began to see education as a proxy for their more generalized concerns about the future. Pollsters reported that people "realize[d] there is a large amount of immigration and that there are large numbers of people who need to learn English and basic skills," and more and more people felt that schools had the enormous responsibility to keep California successful (Purdum 1998: A 1-A 14).

Amidst all this sat California's decision about the role of language/s in schools: Leading up to California's 1998 landmark "English For The Children" Proposition 227, the national tide had been turning against bilingual education. As mentioned in the previous chapter, in 1996 a few districts in California received approval from the state to bypass federal bilingual education mandates and implement their own English-dominant programs for English Learners. Many bilingual education advocates saw the writing on the wall and began to coalesce around the pragmatic counter-position of bilingual programs that limited native language instruction to two to three years. Leading up to the vote on Proposition 227, media discourse on the issue sounded similar to pro-and anti-bilingual education discourses of the past.

Pro- and anti-Proposition 227 discourses

Said one columnist, "The topic of bilingual education has all the elements of a hit television drama, with plot lines about innocent children and the alleged abuse of program monies, power driven egos corrupting the ideals of the little red schoolhouse, and a search for the surest, fastest route to the American Dream." As usual, she continued, "Californians are throwing out the first grenades" in this new battle over bilingual education (Martinez 1998: 28).

An article in the L.A. Weekly, a major city arts and culture paper, summarized the arguments swirling in the media just before the vote this way: The Proposition 227 proponents charged that, "By any objective standard, the state's bilingual education program has failed... [especially in] L.A. Unified... the nation's premier working laboratory for bilingual education, with more than... 46 percent of the district's enrollment who aren't fluent in English" (Blume and Ehrenreich 1998: 20). Proponents added that even with bilingual education, "the Latino dropout rate is still at least 30 percent... Bilingual programs have become a sort of curricular equivalent to Black History Month, emphasizing culture and self-esteem, and then declaring the battle won" (25). As in the earlier debates about bilingual education, the personal stories of students who had not succeeded in bilingual education and of commentators' immigrant grandparents who had "made it" in America without bilingual education abounded. Even LAUSD's teachers union, which officially opposed the proposition though in the face of much internal controversy, printed articles that painted bilingual teachers as "greedy" (because they received a stipend) and teachers in favor of English Only as upholding the ideals of "fairness" (Haguchi 1999: 3).

To the contrary, the measure's opponents argue that bilingual education was largely successful. When done right, they charged, the "results have been entirely respectable," producing test scores for bilingual program students that equal or exceed the scores of their monolingual peers (Blume and Ehrenreich 1998: 20) (this certainly was true at South Central Elementary). And Proposition 227's proposed one-year program to teach solely English, they argued, "may have the practical effect of costing students a year of academic instruction" (21). There was *no* research, they reminded readers, to "offer support for the idea that in one year, children can learn all the English they need to succeed in school" (25), as was proposed by 227. Representing this side of the debate, also, were the personal success stories of bilingual program students, arguments for bilingual education's role in honoring students' home cultures and diversity, and agendas for creating a globally-savvy, multilingual American workforce. Opined one op-ed columnist (Gurza, 1999: B-1),

> Being bilingual may be in, but bilingual education is out, thanks to the English-Only language police.... Proposition 227... can only make matters worse. So while adults pay thousands of dollars trying to learn a second-language in costly crash courses, our children are being forced to forget the languages they already know.... The English-Only movement [can be seen] as an extension of Manifest Destiny, that delusional American ideology that justifies genocide and invasions. And Proposition 227 is a form of white supremacy... 'well rehearsed with American Indian and African American children before it was applied to Latinos' (citing an unnamed university education professor).

In the end, others argued, assimilationist policies like Proposition 227 were counterproductive: "People already want to integrate. But they should be able to keep their rich cultures and heritages" (Ramos 1999: 9 A).

James Crawford, an analyst of language politics in the United States and a vocal proponent of bilingual education, critiqued the media for offering slanted, shallow coverage of the debates. The media and in particular the Los Angeles Times set the terms of the debates quite in favor of "English for the Children," he argued, in the following ways. One, they often covered the issue as a purely political story, not an education story or a science story or a story about shifting demographics (1998: 8). In political news coverage, said Crawford, "a lot of reporters feel they've done their jobs if they present the charges and counter-charges, quote people accurately, and let the best sound-bite win," instead of digging deeper for some objective truths. So, for example, when Ron Unz (the main sponsor and funder of the 227 initiative) made the claim that bilingual education had a "95% failure rate" he was basing this on the fact that on average 5% of California's Limited English Proficient students were reported redesignated to fluent English speaking status each year in the years leading up to the vote. But rarely was it mentioned that only 30% of the state's LEP students were even in bilingual programs to start with and that of those in bilingual programs only 20% had appropriately-certified bilingual teachers (8).

Hence what this "95% failure rate" of bilingual education masked was the truth that, in Blume and Ehrenreich's (1998) words, "The problem was never bilingual education alone, but an entire education system that hasn't delivered" for limited English

speaking students. Bilingual education became the latest in a string of scapegoats for a complex set of issues. It became the poster child of the “immigration complex,” the “official punching bag for politicians and others who attempt[ed] to blame linguistic/ethnic minorities” for “economic, political, religious, educational [problems] that our country faces on a day-to-day basis” (Antrop-González 2002: 14). But reporters quoted Unz's "95% failure rate" of bilingual education so many times that this became part of the unquestioned, "conventional wisdom" swirling around the issue (Crawford 1998: 8).

Two, Crawford argued that the media routinely treated political opponents of bilingual education as experts--Ron Unz's lack of any background in education and his refusal to examine bilingual education research were ignored, and his opinions on the topic were taken as fact (1998: 10). Proposition 227 was, in fact, based on absolutely no educational research. Reporters simply repeated Unz's charge that educators', linguists' and researchers' anti-227 positions were either "just another opinion," (11) or worse, bureaucratic, self-serving attempts to save their jobs (12). And so the details and implications of what Proposition 227 proposed went largely unexposed. One legal policy analyst argued that Proposition 227 was "violative of federal statutes, politically unsound, culturally biased, and pedagogically inaccurate" (Ryan 2002: 487). However, Crawford concluded, reporters did not bother to delve into the dense, complicated body of research on, or the decades of experience that practitioners had with, bilingual education in order to present voters with the objective case of each side. They "saw Unz as good copy" (12) and uncritically took him at his word. In so doing, the media characterized the vote *in Unz's terms*, creating a common sense, hegemonic understanding of the vote as a choice between the "failing," native-language "ghettos" of bilingual education and the hard-to-argue-against *idea* of, "English for the Children."

Debates about the effects of 227's English Immersion

The measure passed on June 2nd by a 61-39% margin (Ricento 2000: 30). Then debates about the issue got really interesting. As it turned out, neither side liked the vagueness of the mandate, as it left much to local interpretation. In one section of the official document it stated that students in all classrooms be taught "overwhelmingly" in English. In another it demanded "nearly all" instruction in English. Statewide, some districts interpreted this to mean using all English, for all intents and purposes. The Los Angeles County Board of Education interpreted this to mean that non-English-speaking pupils could be taught in their primary languages as much as 49% of the time, but they did not dictate a certain percentage to schools. The law's provision for the civil liability of teachers and education officials who violated 227 then seemed ludicrous to practitioners. Teachers unions and others sued the state, charging that, "The proposition is so unconstitutionally vague that teachers cannot determine what actions are prohibited" (Turner 1998: 2). The provision allowing teachers to be sued personally for “violating” the mandate was eventually upheld by the courts. Many charged that this atmosphere of uncertainty and pressure created a classic example of "chilling" the right of free speech (Lyons 1998: 1, 3, 30).

The Los Angeles Unified School District, amongst others, applied for a waiver to 227 to allow it to continue its bilingual programs (Helfand, 1998: B5). Though it was not granted, many felt that the LAUSD allowed some schools to bend the measure or even to challenge it in practice. For example, 227 allowed individual parents to sign waivers that placed their children back into bilingual classrooms, if the parents stated that English Immersion would be detrimental to their child in an academic or emotional way. Principals at each school site interpreted the provision for individual waivers differently (Ramirez 2000), resulting in a wide variety in the amount of primary language support in English Immersion classes and in numbers of bilingual waivers across the District. Said one reporter, "227 has hit bilingual education much like a tornado hopscotching through a subdivision, obliterating some programs and leaving others virtually untouched

(Anderson and Sahagun 1998: A 32). Indeed at some schools there were complaints of not strict enough implementation of English Immersion and at others there were complaints of parents not being allowed to request a waiver for their children to return to a bilingual program (Sahagun and Anderson 1998: B6). Statewide, by 1999 bilingual student numbers had dropped from 400,000 (pre-227) to 170,000, while bilingual waivers doubled between October and May of that year. The READ Institute, a proponent of 227, speculated that, "only 15 percent of the 1000 California school districts were in full compliance with 227" in 1999 (Mora 1999: 6).

Media reports gave vastly different pictures of the effects of 227. Some hailed its success: Shared one commentator ([no author listed] U.S. A. Today, 2000),

> Educators who warned of disastrous consequences from California's ban on bilingual education today find themselves off-balance: Children who shifted rapidly into regular classes taught in English scored far higher on standardized tests than those allowed to spend more time learning in their native languages.

Said another, "At elementary schools scattered across Los Angeles, teachers are delivering promising reports that their students are learning English more quickly than anticipated six months after the implementation of the anti-bilingual education law" (Sahagun 1999d: A 13).

Others reported and predicted doom: The La Opinión Spanish language daily newspaper ran editorials arguing that (Sadek Sanchez 1998: B4, *translation mine*),

> Day by day--because of Proposition 227--our students fall behind. Day by day, the students that only speak English advance. And one day very soon, in March or April of 1999, all students will have to take the same tests--in English: math, science, social studies, language arts. Who will come out ahead on the tests?

A professor at Arizona State University pointed out that in California districts where students remained in bilingual programs reading scores rose at almost double the rate in districts that implemented English Immersion, and that New York City schools

had found similar results; as such, Proposition 227 could be seen as “a dramatic failure” (MacSwan 2001: 8).

Language minority education experts cautioned that even improvements on certain academic indicators post-227 should be viewed with caution. Said one (NABE [no author listed] 1999: 1-11),

> Increases in LEP students' scores for SAT-9 [a norm-referenced, standardized test] from 1998 to 1999 need[ed] to be considered in light of the overall gains in scores found across the state for all students. LEP students' scores in English-Only programs rose, as they did for LEP students in bilingual programs. And, native English speakers in low-performing schools made gains, as did LEP students in low-performing schools. These gains were probably the result of a combination of things. The fact that schools and districts have gotten used to the test and are taking them more seriously should be considered... as well as the fact that a variety of other initiatives such as class-size reduction may be taking effect.

Reporters even pointed out that in some school districts that had received English-Only instruction waivers *before* 227 (exempting them from the previously-mandated bilingual instruction, i.e. where students were receiving English Immersion instruction several years leading up to the measure) redesignation rates were actually falling (fewer English Learners were achieving the qualification of "Fluent English Proficient"). Reporters quoted "bilingual education advocates" as warning that this "could be an omen of the law's negative impact" (Gittelsohn and Chey 1999: 10).

Indeed it was very frustrating trying to find out "the truth" about the effects of Proposition 227. English Only advocates and bilingual education proponents presented wildly different statistics on redesignation rates, test scores and the implications of these (Linquanti 2001: 11, Ed. 2002). The president of the California Association for Bilingual Education was quoted as saying, "English Immersion programs [are like] baking bread at a high temperature: The crust gets brown faster [i.e. students learn basic, or "playground," English] faster, but the inside remains doughy [i.e. students' academic English still takes extended periods of time to develop]" (Gittelsohn and Chey 1999 1,10). Several Los

Angeles Times and La Opinión articles similar to this one quoted English Immersion teachers saying troubling things like (de la Cruz 2000: 1 A, 12 A),

> [Now] we review writing, reading and math in English, again and again. And we use much simpler concepts. [Many Latino students] get behind in their studies and people send them to special education. Many teachers don't use primary language support at all, and yet they think that when a child falls behind, it is a learning problem and not a language problem.

One fact that was agreed upon in the LAUSD was the controversial nature of the District's continued program of stipends for certified bilingual teachers. The Los Angeles Times ran articles about the "battle" that was ripping apart the 40,000-member teachers union (Sahagun 1999c). Of the approximately 4,000 teachers who continued to receive the annual $5000 bonus, 2,600 of them now taught in English Immersion classes. One advocate of eliminating the stipends was quoted as saying that stipends "'aren't justified when you take into account Proposition 227, which mandates English immersion.'" And another said, "'I've never met a teacher in favor of those stipends who wasn't receiving one.'" Advocates of maintaining the stipends pointed out that in LAUSD's English Immersion classrooms "up to 70% of the content can be provided in the students' primary language," hence the stipends were still necessary to attract qualified bilingual teachers. And a member of the union's bilingual committee warned that this controversy was potentially explosive: "' [W]e have a pretty militant committee; mess with us at your peril... We are prepared to fight for our interests" (B3).

It is important to note that educators, communities, researchers and reporters were not only arguing about the straightforward, "simple" effects of Proposition 227. It's effects and implications reached far into other high-stakes education reform movements--most prominently, standardized testing and school accountability rating systems. At that time California was in its first years of using a statewide standardized testing program (the Stanford 9) as part of a new system for rating schools (the Academic Performance Index, API) and as an important accountability measure for other programs, for example the phasing out of the practice of social promotion. Cooper (1999) wrote, "The issue of

English-only tests for students with limited proficiency in the language is particularly sensitive in California. ... Under a new policy mandating an end to social promotion, for example …English-only tests are likely to be part of such criteria." A report by the President's Advisory Commission on Educational Excellence for Hispanic Americans was then quoted: Making "children with limited English skills take tests written only in English and using the results to decide such pivotal questions as promotion or graduation may violate their civil rights" (A 3).

We then read that the state superintendent of Public Instruction said that as a result of the controversy over bilingual education, when it came to deciding issues such as this, "Right now California is confused" (Cooper 1999:A 20). One editorialist, critiquing how this confusion affected LAUSD, put it this way: Given the poor academic achievement of students in general and the crisis in district management (see below), when it came to important academic questions like language instruction for English Learners we were left wondering, "Who makes decisions about these issues during crisis?" It seemed, she opined, that "student needs no longer dictate instruction... politics does" (Sadek Sanchez 1999: 7A).

Given the far-reaching implications of the failure or success of English Immersion and bilingual education, given the notoriety of Proposition 227 nationwide, and given that 227 spawned several spin-off propositions in other states (Arizona, Colorado, Massachusetts), the topic received what *I* saw as *relatively* little nationwide attention between 1998 and 2000. We did read about, "Unz and Arizona" (NABE 1999: 27); about the move to launch a similar proposition in New York (Breslau 2000: 64); about Houston's school board passing a pro-multilingualism policy in fear of a coming Unz initiative in that state (NABE 1999: 27); and about a 227 spin-off initiative in Massachusetts (Unz 2001, Barrera, V. 2002). And we were informed that in September of 1998 the House of Representatives approved HR 3892, The English Language Fluency Act. The bill repealed the Emergency Immigrant Education Act and converted Title VII federal bilingual education programs into a block grant to the states, limiting funding to

those programs designed to exit children into English-Only classes within two years (Loera 1998: 5-6).

Yet other topics in education received more attention, especially after 1998: standardized testing, accountability reform, and the voucher movement for example. In L.A. we also read a lot about our school facilities shortage crisis (particularly the fiasco over the Belmont high school complex) and about our superintendent crisis (between 1999 and 2000 we had three different superintendents, starting with the first one, who was Latino, being deposed in a very controversial and racially-charged atmosphere [Sahagun and Smith 1999]). Even our United Teachers of Los Angeles magazine provided relatively little coverage of Proposition 227 (Haguchi, 1999: 3), shocking to me given that 70% of LAUSD's 700,000 students were Latino and that prior to 227 4,000 union teachers were in bilingual classrooms and even after about 2,600 were (Sahagun 1999c).

Even in La Opinión, a Los Angeles Spanish language paper that usually published stories with a pro-bilingualism slant, an editorial about the then-incoming LAUSD superintendent, Roy Romer, suggested topics that he should address immediately and none of them included language issues (Slavkin 2000). An excerpt from my fieldwork journal in 2000 reflects my reaction to media discourses at that time:

> In the paper today there was an editorial about Roy Romer becoming our new superintendent. They discussed test scores, dividing up the District, etc., but nothing about language, bilingual education, or 227. It is as if this huge, new, controversial program we've implemented doesn't exist. No need to worry about discussing it, Roy, let's just slog along. It's crazy. It's like in a dysfunctional family when people ignore the alcoholic.

This is notable given that when we did read about the politics of bilingual education and English Only we were told that the issue was considered to be a civil-rights struggle, "almost on par with *Brown vs. Board of Education*" (Breslau 2000: 64). Those on Ron Unz's side characterized the prospect of continued bilingual education on a national scale as, in Unz's words (2001), "an even greater horror" than "massive deaths

from anthrax or suicide bombers" (this was in the post-Sept. 11th era). Americans, he urged, "must remain silent no longer" against the "terror" of native language instruction (Unz 2001)! And still academics, policymakers and politicians continued to urge for increased multilingualism in the United States. In March, 2000, the head of the Department of Education in the Clinton administration was quoted in several newspapers as urging districts to implement more bilingual education in order to provide multilingual workers for a new global economy (Hastings 2000a: B 6).

Amidst these wildly different *arguments* about the facts and import of demographic change and globalism, English Only, Spanish, English immersion and bilingual education—about who *we were* as a nation--people at South Central Elementary *lived* the English Only, English Immersion and bilingual programs. In the next chapter I discuss their, our, and my experiences of these in the post-227 terrain. At various points I will reflect on the ways in which local discourses acted within and against those in the national media. With Woolard I will ask not only how the national might inform the local but how conversely, the "constant acting in view of the system [might] alter the system itself" (1989: 16)? I hope that in doing so I illuminate aspects of the different pressures and opportunities within struggles for cultural citizenship at the local and national levels.

CHAPTER 5 THE LOCAL POST-PROPOSITION 227 TERRAIN

Homework

I returned again to South Central Elementary in August, 1998, just two months after Proposition 227 passed. Different from the 1996 research period, this time I returned not only to conduct research but also to teach. The next two years would be grueling for me. I had to do not only all the things a good anthropologist does but I was also "Ms. Anderson, room 112." I had the exciting, challenging task of educating third graders at a time when California schools were undergoing the massive, rapid changes brought by Proposition 227. On top of that, I wore several other hats from 1998-2000: I served as the school's Standards-Based Assessment Coordinator, helping to introduce a new performance assessment system and to increase the rigor in our standards-based instruction. I served on the school's Professional Development Committee, helping to plan and implement training for our faculty. In an effort to increase connections between our school and the neighborhood I founded a high school tutoring program, recruiting students from our feeder high school to tutor our kindergarten through fifth-graders. At one point we had enough tutors to cover almost every class in our school--a few of them having been students of mine from my earlier days at South Central Elementary! Coming full circle from when I left teaching in 1994, I also worked at the District level as an instructor in the District Intern (alternative credentialing) Program, teaching "Brain-Based Teaching and Learning" and "Diversity in Education" courses (remember, the invitation to teach in the DI program was one thing that pushed me into graduate school). During some of my vacations I served as an assistant advisor to prospective intern teachers in the District's personnel department.

Why did I decide to do all these things when ethnographic research is full-time work in its own right? Because this time I did not want to be just a data collector, just someone who was just there to "take." I wanted this project to be "homework" as much as "fieldwork." I wanted to be able to ask and answer questions from shifting positions

(Haraway 1988), sometimes as anthropologist, sometimes as teacher, sometimes as white person, sometimes as bilingual advocate, sometimes as EO advocate, sometimes as activist. As discussed in the introductory chapter I believe that the native or insider's perspective on data and political involvement in the field generates unique, powerful analytical insights and enriches the ethnographic project (Reed-Danahay 1997, Abu-Lughod 1991, Behar 1993, Weston 1998, Kondo 1990). I hoped to bring an activist component to the project, using my research process and data as a springboard for reflective, critical discussion and problem solving amongst school community members about the socio- political issues and conflicts on campus. I wanted, basically, the classic teacher's dream: to make a difference.

"Your girl Andrea is tripping!": the difficulties of activist research begin

This was difficult from the beginning. A few months before my arrival I sent my resume to the hiring committee. Given my qualifications and past experience at the school, they placed me on the matrix (the organizational chart listing all classes and teachers) for the next school year right away. However a few weeks later I got a call from Enrique, the Bilingual Program Coordinator and a close friend of mine. He told me that Andrea, the vice principal, was suddenly uncomfortable with me coming back to the school. Since I knew her personally I called her immediately and asked her to share with me her reservations. She told me that it was my research project that worried her:

> This is a different school than when you worked here. We are not doing as well as we should be. ... So I don't want anything disrupting the staff. I don't want you running around with any surveys. I don't want any of this "he said/she said" stuff. Our staff is in enough turmoil right now as it is. We don't need anyone or anything disrupting us from the business of teaching kids.

I told her that I understood those concerns. I assured her that I would conduct my research as unobtrusively as possible. I agreed not to do a survey. I explained that my research would consist of mostly observations and interviews that I would conduct with

volunteers after they--and I--had completed our teaching duties. I told her that to protect anonymity and avoid “he said/she said” dynamics, I would not use people's real names or even the school’s real name in any writing I did about the project. She responded, "I still don't know, I'm not sure, but in the end I am not the principal. You need to speak with the principal." So I spoke with him. He was fine with the idea, even suggesting that I introduce my project to everyone and solicit volunteer interviewees at the first faculty meeting. My place on the matrix was secure, he said. I was scheduled to teach a third grade Track B class (South Central is a multi-track year-round school). I would arrive a few weeks after the track's school year began so a friend of mine (also a former teacher at the school) would substitute for me for those first few weeks. I thought everything was set.

Then a few weeks before I left Austin for L.A. I got a call from my substitute-friend. She said, "Your girl Andrea is tripping. She took your name off the matrix and when she went downtown [to the District offices] to hire people she recruited someone specifically for your spot before she filled any of the other positions that were open!" I called the principal and asked him if it was still possible to save a position for me. On the urgings of Enrique and Roslyn, the Title 1 Coordinator, the principal spoke to the teacher hired for "my spot" and asked him if he would take another of the open positions. He agreed. "My" position, I was told, was again "mine." I crossed my fingers. In my fieldwork journal I wrote,

> I guess I see the risks of activist research! I'm already seeing that the threat of my research is big. I got the impression that Andrea thought I would criticize her or the school or that I would purposely flame the fire of conflict. Jeez. I guess if she puts up another fight I could take a job and do research at another school. Who knows. Great.

When I got to school Andrea welcomed me and never mentioned the incident.

A school community still in transition

Demographically, the trends that began a few decades earlier had continued: By 1998 the LAUSD student body had risen to 681,505, 68.5% being Hispanic/Latino, 13.8% African-American, 10.9% white, 4.3% Asian, 1.9% Filipino, 0.6% Indian and Pacific Islander (Los Angeles Unified School District 1997-98); the Latino population continued to be the fastest-growing. LAUSD's English Learners comprised a huge chunk of the state's just-over-one-million English Learners by 1999 (The Multilingual News 1999: 10). On our campus Latino students comprised 91% of our student body by 1999, African-Americans 9% (California Department of Education 2000). At the end of 1998 and going into 1999, amongst all adults including teachers, administrators, and other staff members, 53% were Latino, 24% were Black, 21% were white and 2% were Asian. Amongst the faculty and staff I counted lots of old friends and colleagues. However there were also many new faces. Our school, like many in the vicinity, had a high turnover rate and each year brought a number of new teachers.

227

The vote on 227 was just as controversial in the LAUSD as it was across the state: One union representative opined in our United Teacher newsletter, "Rarely has our union been as divided on an issue as we are now on bilingual education. If anything, the passage of Proposition 227 has made the division more acute, by creating uncertainty about policy" (Lasken 1998: 14). Another noted that some union sources claimed that "almost half of the teachers in LAUSD supported English for the Children," while other sources claimed that it was much less (Ramos 1998: 14). At South Central Elementary the vote was also a hot issue in the months just before June. One teacher circulated a petition in favor of the measure. Most others said they shared their opinions frequently and passionately, one-on-one or in small groups. I was never able to gather reliable data on what percentages of people on campus voted for and against 227--I did not interview everyone, a few of the people I interviewed did not share with me which way they had

voted (sharing this was entirely up to them--it was not an interview question), and I decided not to send out a survey requesting this sensitive information given the concern (even hostility) that the idea of a survey had caused as I negotiated my teaching position with the vice principal.

As discussed in the previous chapter, districts and schools implemented "English for the Children" differently due to the great latitude allowed by the vague wording of the initiative (Ramirez 2000). Everything seemed up for interpretation, from what kind of programs would qualify as meeting the guidelines, to whether or not a school district had to offer the "waiver to bilingual instruction" option, to what curricular materials were appropriate, to what exactly a student had to do to demonstrate "reasonable fluency" in order to transition out of Immersion into English Only instruction, to the extent to which parents had a choice of what program their child was placed in. In a few districts each school was allowed to decide on its own how to interpret and implement 227 (Ramirez 2000).

Even the very crux of the initiative--exactly how much primary language support was allowed in immersion classrooms--was vague. Section 306d of the Proposition outlined a structured English immersion process "in which nearly all classroom instruction is in English but with the curriculum and presentation designed for children who are learning the language" (Los Angeles Unified School District 1998a). Another section said that "nearly all" instruction must be in English. In some districts this meant that all instruction was in English, period. The Los Angeles County Board of Education interpreted this to mean that students' home languages could be used as much as 49% of the time. In other counties and districts, "nearly all" meant other things. In Riverside it meant that 40% of instruction could be in students' primary languages. The assistant superintendent for instructional services in the Riverside Unified School District was quoted as saying about their proposed 60% of instruction in English, "'... if Unz could call 61% an overwhelming majority on Proposition 227 [the Proposition had won by a 61-39% margin], what the heck is wrong with our program?'" (Lyons 1998: 3).

The great irony of this initiative was that it purported to seek statewide uniformity and improvement in the teaching of immigrant and Limited English Proficient students. It ended up fostering, from my perspective as a teacher and in reading media reports, much more variety in instructional approaches than before, and almost untenable amounts of uncertainty, confusion and debatable results in its first two years of implementation. Rumors circulated at South Central Elementary about all manner of scenarios of school, classroom, and instructional reorganization. We were held in suspense until just days before the school year began, when we were finally informed about the District's 227 implementation plan.

The Los Angeles Unified School District implemented two Structured English Immersion programs, called Model A and Model B: Model A consisted of "instruction in English using special methods in English with support of the home language" (Los Angeles Unified School District 1998d). We were told that this meant we taught all in English and only helped students using the primary language *one-on-one* if we had already tried all other ways we knew to convey understanding. Model B consisted of "instruction primarily in English using special methods in English combined with the home language used by the teacher to develop academic concepts" (Los Angeles Unified School District 1998d). We were told that this meant we could "preview and review" the concepts in Spanish but the meat of the lesson was to be in English. Primary language support could be used with groups of students.

Because the Immersion programs allowed the use of students' native languages, Model A and Model B teachers with bilingual qualifications continued to receive bilingual stipends of up to $5000 (I received the full amount). Given the continued use of at least some home language/s in Model A and Model B rooms and the still-growing need to communicate with non-English-speaking parents, the District continued to actively recruit bilingual teachers in Spanish, Armenian, Cantonese, Mandarin, Farsi, Japanese, Korean, Filipino, Russian, Samoan, Serbo-Croatian, Spanish and Vietnamese. The District also specified that dual-language bilingual programs could continue in the limited

number of schools where it had previously existed, but these once acclaimed programs fizzled, dropping from 10 to 4 by the spring of 2002 (Blume 2002: 18).

Schools across the District had widely varying numbers of students in "waiver" classrooms post-227. The District's transition bilingual programs continued where parents filled out "waiver" paperwork and where, according to District policy, there were at least 20 waiver requests at the same grade level. This was, *unless* "*the school administration determines* that the alternative program requested would not be beneficial for the student" (Los Angeles Unified School District 1998c, italics mine) (i.e. the final decision if waivers were granted would be made by each school's principal). We heard reports about schools where administrators were perceived to be encouraging or discouraging their entire parent community to go one way or the other, "waiver" or English Immersion. At South Central there were several public meetings held to inform parents about all of their programmatic options--English Immersion, "waiver" bilingual, and English Only. Largely, though, it fell to us individual teachers to speak with parents on a one-on-one basis to answer questions and make recommendations. After sending the paperwork home I called my parents to solicit their input about which program they wanted their children in. Most chose one of the Immersion options, a few chose the waiver bilingual option and a couple chose to place their children straight into English Only. Before making these decisions, however, most parents had lots of questions for me. What did I recommend, they wanted to know?

In this nervous time teachers had to be careful of even how we worded our "recommendations" to parents. We had to frame them as "professional advice"--we could not be seen to be advocating either for or against bilingual education or English Immersion. In the midst of implementing one of the most politicized educational policy measures in recent memory, advocacy on our part was seen as "too political." In the September, 1998 "Spotlight" Newsletter for LAUSD Employees, the official directive from the Superintendent was, "In short: Advice, Yes; Advocacy, No" (Los Angeles Unified School District 1998e). I advised parents that if they wanted their children to attain literacy in Spanish *while* they worked towards literacy in English, I recommended a

waiver for the bilingual program. I shared with them my previous experiences of success with the program, of transitioning the majority of my bilingual classes into the English program for the next grade with the expectation that the rest of the students would transition by the end of the following grade. I was always nervous to say too much about this, however, because I did not want to be seen as "advocating." I advised them that if they wanted the total focus to be on English literacy (utilizing Spanish only as a minimal aide in doing so) I recommended English Immersion (and given research showing the benefits of the use of the primary language in second language learning, Model B, which allowed more first language support, over Model A). As many of my colleagues also found, many parents in my room expressed a concern that their children stay in my class as opposed to moving to another teacher, regardless of what program choice that meant.

How did implementation go? "It was constant chaos."

When we actually implemented the policy teachers on each track received only 2 days of training, *2 days before* implementing this new, untried program. This "training" we got from a District representative consisted of basic ESL techniques and mixed messages about curricular guidelines: We were told verbally that we were to focus on teaching the English vocabulary in the content areas and to worry less about the content material itself (i.e. teach the *vocabulary* of math, science, etc. and worry less about whether students understand the *concepts* in math, science, etc.) (my field notes, October, 1998). Yet the documents outlining the Prop 227 Immersion programs that we were given stated that the students' first language could be used by the teacher or T. A. to ensure students understood the *content* material (Los Angeles Unified School District 1998a).

Many teachers had mixed classrooms with Model A and Model B students. They wondered aloud, "What do I do if I want to preview a lesson in Spanish for my Model B kids? Tell my Model A kids to put their hands over their ears?" Those of us who had combinations of "waiver to bilingual" students *and* Model A *and/or* Model B students

were even more apprehensive about this question. Neither the District representative nor our administrators had a definitive answer. Our administrators guessed what proper Immersion instruction might look and sound like. I remember sitting there, flabbergasted. We later received a memo from our Bilingual Program Coordinator stating that in Model B we could use Spanish only up to 30% of the day, while my principal told me verbally that I could "use as much Spanish as I needed" to make sure my kids understood. In the Los Angeles Times we read that LAUSD English Immersion classes could have "up to 70% of the content in the students' primary language" (Sahagun 1999c: B3).

These inconsistencies and guesses were incomprehensible to us as teachers. Just what were we responsible for? Would we be monitored, sanctioned if we used one too many Spanish phrases? I cannot stress enough the frustration and even fear on the part of bilingual-turned-immersion teachers and T. A.'s at that time. Not only was everything we knew about how children learned languages being turned upside down and delegitimized, but this new "silver bullet" approach to preparing our students "to fully participate in the American Dream" (Unz and Tuchman 1997: 1) was unclear to us--how could we teach well what we did not understand? And within this context of fuzzy policy guidelines, Proposition 227 allowed (still allows) for *teachers to be sued personally* by parents if parents felt that their children weren't learning enough English.

At South Central, the track that began the school year "off-track" (on vacation) began Proposition 227 when they started school in September. The two tracks that began school in July, however, continued their regular programs and classroom compositions through the first "on track" session (until Winter holiday break). I was teaching on one of these tracks. So, I taught a bilingual program up through Winter break and after New Years we began 227, going cold turkey to the mandated 30 days of 100% English instruction. After the 30 days parents chose to place their children in Model A or Model B English Immersion, back into the "waiver " bilingual program, or even straight into English Only.

Contrary to my assumptions and those of other teachers I spoke with before implementation, 227 not only affected bilingual program teachers and students, but *all* of us. Bilingual classes *and* English Only classes at South Central Elementary had to be reorganized to accommodate parents' choices of program. The full range of English materials then had to be distributed to formerly bilingual classrooms, and many did not come right away. In the meantime some of us had our students' Spanish textbooks taken out of their desks and carted away as students, "traumatized" in the words of one colleague, looked on. One of my February, 1999 field note entries reads,

> On January 4th we began 227, the 100% cold-turkey 30 days. I did not know what to expect, really, from my students. We discussed it before vacation, that we would do a lot more English when we came back. They seemed a little scared. But in January they seemed ready to go, and actually rolled with the punches pretty well. We have to do a lot of hands-on activities, I repeat more, we do problem solving together. But there were no big incidents as some teachers have worried. Last week they let us know that on Friday we would switch, because the mandatory one month of the immersion was ending. Up until the last minute Enrique was working on the new class rosters. On Thursday he came to me on our way in from lunch and said, "Kim, which class would you like? The third grade bilingual class or the third grade modified (15 Model B, 15 bilingual) class? You have to decide now, right now." So right there in the hall with 20 kids fidgeting in line behind me, we decided I would have the modified class. Such a big decision, almost like a coin toss. I would lose five students and get five new ones.

After that first reorganization of the entire school came continual reorganizations of students as parents changed their minds--some multiple times--about which program they preferred. (I heard from the Bilingual Program Coordinator that many parents did not understand the differences between the programs so they made choices on a trial and error basis.) I got worn out by a seemingly endless process of integrating new students into my class, of bidding students goodbye as they switched to new teachers, and of trading students' cum folders, report cards, and work samples with other teachers.

That first year of 227 it was difficult pin down exactly how our matrix "ended up" because the tracks began implementation at different times and then there were multiple

subsequent reorganizations of students. Things settled down eventually, though, and going into 1999-2000 the matrix listed the following class compositions: Model A, Model B, or mixed A and B: 25; waiver to bilingual: 12; mixed bilingual, Model A and/or B: 13; English Only 3; English Only mixed with Model A, Model B, and/or bilingual: 9. By June of 2000 our 2000-2001 matrix listed the following expected class compositions: Model A, Model B, or mixed A and B: 18; waiver to bilingual: 16; mixed bilingual; Model A and/or B: 7; English Only 1; English Only mixed with Model A, Model B, and/or bilingual: 19 (note: classes with at least partial bilingual composition went from 25 in 1999-2000 to 23 in 2000-2001; classes with at least partial English Only composition went from 12 in 1999-2000 to 20 in 2000-2001.).

While people felt differently about the ideals behind English Immersion and bilingual education, one thing that most agreed on was the difficulty and confusion we all went through those first two years of Proposition 227. People across the school community used the word "chaos" to describe the instructional, organizational and social environments at that time, and many people confided to me that this made it difficult to "just get through the day." One bilingual-turned-English-Immersion teacher reminisced at the end of that first year of 227,

> My class was destroyed. Every couple of weeks I traded multiple students. I ended up with a total of 4 students from my original class by April 28, when [standardized, Stanford 9] testing began. And on that day I had a whole group of students who were brand-new the week before the test. So much for accountability! It wreaked havoc--and the District still doesn't know what the curriculum is going to be! 227 wasn't *implemented* [sarcastically] in my classroom. It was just constant chaos.

The (bilingual) teacher who took our Title I Coordinator position after Roslyn left said, "I think that we did the best we could but it was probably a disaster. We didn't have the materials, the training, a curriculum, we didn't have um, anything but the law to go by." Added our Bilingual Program Coordinator who took over after Enrique left in 2000, "Well, as you know, because you are teaching it, there is no actual set program. I mean we don't really have, all we have is, you know what I mean? So as the teacher, [when he

taught Immersion last year in the classroom] I was just kind of wading through murky waters." This, from two people in the school who were charged with monitoring implementation and compliance in our academic programs!

We didn't get any firm curricular guidelines until the beginning of the 99-2000 year when we began to discuss grade level English Language Development (ELD) standards, but even still these were skeletal. Many of us felt, for a long time, like we were wandering on our own in uncharted territory, with only our instincts to guide us. Even several "African-American/EO" staff members who had expressed anti-bilingual education sentiment in the past said, like Michael, "If I had known the chaos 227 would cause at this school, I would not have voted for it." In this context of massive programmatic changes, unclear curricular guidelines, frazzled staff members and confused parents, consistent quality teaching was a challenge. Unquestionably, our academic environment was affected drastically, and in many ways negatively.

Continuing disparities in student achievement

As in 1996, student achievement data sparked many conversations about equity and excellence for all of our students. In 1999 South Central Elementary's statewide Academic Performance Index (API) rank was a 1 (the lowest possible score) out of 10. Our 1998-1999 school wide mean score on the Stanford 9 standardized test was in the 16th percentile (California Department of Education 2000). Within this alarmingly low level of average school wide student achievement there were further disparities. 1998-99 and 1999-2000 Stanford 9 reports showed the following trends: Latino Limited English Proficient students scored near the English Only students, somewhat higher or lower depending on the grade level; Latino students who went from Limited English Proficient to Redesignated Fluent English Proficient (exiting either the bilingual or English Immersion program) scored the same as *or up to more than twice as high* in reading, language and math as the mostly-African-American English Only students--and they did this in their second language!

With the increased focus on English Language Development in the Model A and Model B classes and the increased push by the District to redesignate those students (from LEP to RFEP, ready for English Only), the redesignation rate at South Central took off: The principal reported in June of 2000 that we had gone from redesignating "only 3 or 4 students" in 1997-1998, to 100 in 1998-1999, to 170 in 1999-2000 (my field notes). In 1999-2000 the school underwent a state-mandated Program Quality Review (that all schools cycled through every four years). Administrators shared with teachers that the PQR process identified the major student achievement need for our school as closing the achievement gap between our generally lower-scoring African-American/EO and our often higher-scoring Latino/bilingual/LEP students.

“Going to meet your new research subjects?”

Upon arriving at South Central Elementary in 1998 the neighborhood seemed about the same, though I noticed a few changes: There was now a big grocery chain store with a bank branch inside (before, the grocery stores were small convenience store type markets). There were a few fast food chain restaurants down the street from school. There also seemed to be less graffiti in the neighborhood. But the campus itself felt the same as I walked through the gate my first day. I was so happy to be back. I had missed teaching kids, I had missed my friends. I was anxious, though, too. How would it go? I had prepared for my first few weeks on campus by studying my curriculum materials, planning lessons, spending lots of money at the teacher supply store, readying my fieldwork notebook, buying batteries for my tape recorders, and finalizing my interview questions. Could I be the best teacher *and* the best anthropologist possible?

My first morning back on campus I was walking with a friend out to the playground to pick up our students. He nodded towards the group of third graders lined up waiting for me and asked, "So, going to meet your new research subjects?"

"No," I replied, "I'll tell you about my research subjects tomorrow." The next day at the faculty meeting I explained that the continued focus of my research was *us*--the

adults at South Central Elementary. How did we define ourselves and our relationships post-227? What was on our minds as educators, professionals, community members? And how did our lives at school relate to and even maybe act back upon trends in national-level media and politics in the post-227 era? Given my difficulty getting back into the community to do research I did not introduce the activist aspect of my project that day. As I share in the next chapter, that would have to wait until the next school year.

Throughout the next two years I explored how the "cultural artifacts" of English Only education, bilingual education and English Immersion looked and felt from multiple subject positions at South Central Elementary. I traced the "multiplicity of socio-material concerns" that people expressed and the differential personal, political and material outcomes that they experienced vis-à-vis our local lives and our understandings of ourselves within larger social contexts (Rosaldo 1994: 244-245). I sought to unwrap the "collective fictions" that we told about ourselves and others to carve out and/or maintain cultural citizenship in the community--our sense of belonging, entitlement, agency and dignity, within dynamics of negotiation, dispute and conflict (Rosaldo 1994: 243-244, Flores and Benmayor 1997:13).

Discursive Fingerprints endure: African-American, EO, Latino, bilingual, Immersion

Urciuoli reminds us that the words people choose to describe the social conditions in which they live "tells a great deal about how their world is put together, particularly its power relations." Hence a focus on semiotics is important: "[H]ow people talk about language, race, and class must be interpreted in terms of their social location[s]" (1996: 1,2). After Peirce (1956) and Silverstein (1976), she urges us to pay attention to the meanings and pragmatics of metacommunicative discourses--they can be seen to index connection, causality, social location, and strategic performance (7).

In the pre-227 chapter I examined how in constructing arguments about what was wrong and what needed to be done, people used several key terms interchangeably, mapping the linguistic and programmatic onto the racial and articulating to nation: African-American and English Only; Latino and bilingual; both sides constructed themselves as elementally "American." How they did so provided a window into power relations and struggles for cultural citizenship both locally and nationally, into the fluidity and interdependency of identity/political categories of language, race and nation, and into how these terms indexed and leveraged identification, difference, and access to voice and structures of power (Ong 1996, Harrison 1998).

Returning to South Central Elementary I wondered if I would find shifts in the pragmatics of the pre-227 metacommunicative discourses (or new ones) to match shifts in policy and politics (that I expected to find). For example, would new terms like "227" and "Model A/Model B" become hot button symbols and if so, how would they function? Shore and Wright (1997) argue that shifts in the semantics or pragmatics of a key symbol become "fingerprints for tracing more profound transformations" in human relations (19). Similarly, drawing on Bakhtin, Roediger (1991) states that a "change in signifiers itself signal[s] a new set of social realities and racial meanings" (15).

What I found surprised me: Instead of finding changes I found continuity in the terms themselves. "Latino/bilingual" and "African-American/EO" continued to be the terms that demarcated difference on campus. These terms, with the linguistic mapped onto racial and vice versa (and the pair articulated to ideas about nation) continued to be used interchangeably and continued to be "key symbols" that served as the means through which different groups in the population meaningfully disagreed (Woolard 1989). What did shift was the content of the terms. It had expanded to fit the new situation: Latino and bilingual continued to-- interchangeably-- index school community members who were or were perceived to be in favor of, Latinos, the Spanish-language, or bilingual education. And while like before 227, "Latino/bilingual" was an internally heterogeneous group—while people on this side could also be white or Black, now they could also be part of the English Immersion Model A/Model B programs. African-

American and EO continued to--interchangeably-- index school community members who were or were perceived to be in favor of, African-Americans and English Only education. Similarly, "African-American/EO" people could also be white or Latino, and could now even teach in a Model A/Model B class.

Just a few examples of the daily ways in which this was expressed are as follows. A new Immersion teacher reflected, "When I hear African-American teachers, EO teachers talk about the bilingual kids I don't think they differentiate between bilingual and Model A/Model B. I think it's all the same to them." And Crystal told me how the administration had recently begun to hold more meetings "for EO parents, for that race." And Frank, who was now an Immersion Model B teacher, put it bluntly: He said to me during a conversation about our classes that year, "Kim, your kids who are low now will be the ones in my fifth-grade bilingual class, the ones with the attitude like, 'I don't know and I don't care' [he rolls his eyes with frustration]." I responded, "Mmm, aren't all of our kids in Model B [with a questioning look]?" "I know," he said. "I consider Model A and Model B *to be bilingual*. It's all the same."

I found this over and over, people referring to Model A and Model B staff members as "bilingual," and people referring to African-Americans as "EO" even if they taught Model A and Model B. One day as we talked about classroom reorganization the principal shed a clear light on the enduring quality of the discursive language-race conflation, and how Model A and Model B fit and even continued to fuel the earlier dichotomy,:

> The big problem at South Central is that language here isn't just language it's also race. If you organize classrooms based on language you end up organizing them also by race. I think that's something people thought was going to get solved by 227. It didn't, really. We still organize by Model A and Model B on one side and EO on the other, we're still not really integrating classrooms. And I think if the school had gone with 227 the way some people thought, then they probably would be integrated, everybody together.

The fact that there was little change in pragmatics of key discursive symbols from 1996, and that new key pedagogical terms were fit into old molds, speaks volumes about

the importance of understanding policy as both received directive and contested cultural resource; and policy changes both as changes in official institutional mandates and *as programmatic shifts within which local actors continue to negotiate enduring cultural, social, and professional dynamics*.

As I examine the constructions of post-227 cultural citizenship, I keep in mind Levinson and Holland's (1996) assertion that the supposedly essential categories, discourses and symbols deployed in struggle are actually open political categories (11). Rather than static givens , the contours and content of these categories are negotiated "in struggle" (11; see also Handler 1988, Foley, N. 1997, Dominguez 1986, Hall 1996). Finding out why Model A/Model B could "mean" bilingual to many school community members, for example, can help illuminate the complex subject positions people occupy within different social, cultural, economic and professional locations (Giroux 1992b). In my writing, then, I keep the "Latino/bilingual" and "African-American/EO" terms intact (and in tension) in describing school community dynamics post-227 because people at South Central did so.

This general stability in the key metacommunicative discourses on campus indexes my major finding from my time at South Central post-227 : The dynamics of the 1996 "war" did not seem to change very much, even though 227 curtailed (and was meant to dismantle) the *supposed* central issue of the earlier conflict—the bilingual program. I found that 227 simply shifted the intensity of the conflict. The pre-227 all-out combat became a series of decentralized skirmishes post-227--conversations, for example, in the lunch room, in the parking lot, at school leadership council meetings, and with me--amidst the chaos of drastic, rapid programmatic change. Many people felt that "their own" students, parents and teachers still ended up on the wrong side of the answer to the old question, Who are the valued members of our school community, and what does that say about us?

For those who asked this question, while politics at South Central Elementary were less volatile, the dynamics behind them were the same in 1998-2000 as they were in

1996. I heard whispers of, "I would work harder on this," and "I would go the extra mile on this, if they [referring to the "them" on the other side of the earlier conflict] would act right," or "if they would address our issues." I saw many opportunities for collaborative projects to improve the educational environment at South Central Elementary lost. Morale was still low. On the LAUSD annual Stakeholders' Satisfaction Survey (a District survey completed at most schools), only 56% of respondents (faculty, staff, administration, parents) reported that, "In general, I am satisfied with our school" for 1998-1999.

By contrast, others of those—fewer in number, though--I spoke with in 1998-2000 shared that they did not wonder "who we were" and "what this meant." They contended that the 1996 "war" was either a part of the school community's history that they did not know or a relic of the past that they thought should be kept in the past. Things were generally OK at South Central Elementary, these people told me. And indeed the low 1998-1999 56% school satisfaction rate was a surprising 20% higher than the year before. In 1997-98, just as the statewide campaigns for and against 227 were reaching their zenith and just one year after I had investigated the "war" on campus, only 35.4% of respondents had reported satisfaction.

In the next section I update readers on some of the key voices from the earlier "war" and introduce some new ones.

Voices in the post-227 context

Voices from the "African-American/EO" side

Given the demographic shifts still occurring in South Central Los Angeles, by 1998 few people on campus worked solely with "African-American/EO" students anymore. Three key voices from the pre-227 "war" continued to be key voices post-227, while technically having a foot in both the EO and Immersion programs. Janice continued to be an outspoken, passionate voice for the "African-American/EO" teachers,

students and community, though she now taught students in the EO and Model A programs. Michael continued to serve on the school's LEARN committee and as a classified employees union representative. He was still a controversial figure on campus, still a vocal advocate for Black students and staff members. Post-227, however, he worked as an Educational Aide in a classroom with EO, Model A and Model B students. Eleanor also continued to work as an Educational Aide, and, like Michael, worked with EO and Model A students. She continued to be an active member in the school community, popular amongst the Educational Aides, and volunteered to help with holiday celebrations, Career Days and other social and academic activities.

Looking beyond dichotomies: "African-American/EO" border crossers

Now more people than ever seemed to cross the line between sides that were still discursively drawn. As Roslyn put it, while the conflict still simmered post-227 she could see that, "There was this faction and that faction, you know, and you could belong to different factions. I was in the [*x*]-grade faction, I was in the Black faction, and I was also in the new teacher-pro-bilingual faction. And sometimes they crossed and there were different interests." The "battles were kept low" post-227 because, "I couldn't be battling with somebody that the next moment I was aligned to on another issue…. But that was just me. Some of the hard-core people never crossed lines." At the beginning of the 1998-99 school year Roslyn was still in her coordinator position but half-way through the school year she transferred to a District-level position. She continued to stay in contact with many members of the South Central community, including me.

Frank continued to teach, teaching mostly Model A/Model B classes. Elizabeth also continued to teach, with mixed Immersion and EO classes, until in 2000 she was chosen to take an out-of-the-classroom instructional supporter position. While she had been recognized as a successful and supportive teacher of "African-American/EO" students, she was encouraged by staff members of all demographic groups to take this position that would have her working with upper-grade teachers and students across all language programs.

A new vocal force for this side was Mary. Mary, who was white, began working at South Central in 1994. In 1996 she did not emerge in interviews or my observations as a key voice, but by 1998 she sought out any opportunity she could to express to me and to other colleagues--at the lunch table, in whispers during professional development sessions, in social settings--her opinions about the inequities between "African-American/EO" and "Latino/bilingual" education at the school. Others also cited her in interviews as a representative of this side's views. Of the several new EO or mixed Immersion/EO staff members who came on board between 1998-2000, none were mentioned to me in conversations or interviews as dominant voices on this side of the community, even though in private conversations with me some advocated strongly for "African-American/EO" students on campus.

Voices from the "Latino/bilingual" side

Enrique continued to work as South Central's Bilingual Program Coordinator in 1998, but the next year he moved to a different school. During the time he was at South Central in the post-227 context he was still a vocal supporter of bilingual education, even while his job now also encompassed coordinating the English Immersion program. Many on the “African-American/EO” side still considered Enrique to be in part responsible for what they saw as the neglect of African-American students, the favoring of Latino students, and the incomplete compliance with Proposition 227. Even after he left his name would surface in discussions about current issues on campus.

By 1998 Crystal had transferred from a position as TA to one as an office administrative assistant. As such she was highly visible to all stakeholders as they passed through the office. She could often be heard speaking Spanish with her sister who still worked on campus and with many of the bilingual TA's, with whom she was close.

Looking beyond dichotomies: "Latino/bilingual" border crossers

Scott had left South Central Elementary by 1998. Some people said it was because he felt unwelcome on campus after the blackface incident; others surmised that, "he just wanted to do something different." Linda became an English Immersion teacher in 1998. Early on that year she made no secret of her distaste for Proposition 227. She was vocal about her continued support for bilingual education. A few months into implementation, however, during interviews she shared her pleasant surprise with how fast children seemed to be learning English in her class and all across campus, going so far during one interview later that year as to chastise the teachers who had full waivered bilingual classes, charging that they were holding children back by going against the rest of the school. And she still vigorously defended the District's bilingual teacher stipend (that she was a recipient of).

Andrea was still assistant principal in 1998 and through 2000. Throughout that time she was officially supportive of 227 but often publicly expressed her lack of personal belief in English Immersion and her dedication to bilingual education.

A new "Latino/bilingual" border crosser was Amy. She joined the faculty as a District Intern just after my 1996 research. She was politically active in the anti-Proposition 187, 209 and 227 campaigns in Los Angeles. Very pro-bilingual, Amy actively advised parents of the advantages of bilingual education when it came time for them to choose the program their children would enroll in. She taught a full "waiver bilingual" classroom both years, 1998-2000. She was often mentioned by others as either an inspiration in the fight to "save" bilingual education or as one of those who was "cheating 227" by not implementing the mandated immersion. Amy was white.

Of the many new bilingual or Model A/Model B teachers who joined the staff between 1998-2000, none were mentioned to me in conversations or interviews as particularly powerful voices for this side of the community, even though in private with me some expressed pro-"Latino/bilingual" sentiments.

The Black Face Incident... to Mexican Mother's Day

It's a hot, sunny Wednesday in May, 2000. For two weeks students had been preparing Mother's Day gifts--cards, paintings, tissue paper flowers, and jar-top picture frames. The Mother's Day celebration committee, a small group of volunteer staff members and parents, had solicited teachers to have their classes give a presentation. I signed up my class to recite a poem. Invitations had been sent out to all the parents. We stopped our lessons early, practiced our poem, "Mothers," one more time, grabbed our gifts and headed excitedly for the yard. As we opened the double doors out onto the yard we saw the entire playground festooned with Mexican paper cut-outs. Merengue music was blaring. Classes lined up facing each other with a large performance area in the middle. At one end of the lines was the sound system and the area for classes to gather before they walked out to perform. At the other end were the parents, around 60 by my count; my brief "eyeball assessment" of the group noted less than a handful of African-Americans. The celebration committee chairperson (and the school's official Community Representative), a Latina, gave a welcome speech, speaking elaborately in Spanish and briefly in English. Then came the presentations. There were traditional Mexican folk dances danced, current salsa hits choreographed, and traditional Mexican songs sung. The entire 40 minute extravaganza included only two presentations in English: one class lip synched and danced to a Jennifer Lopez song and my class recited "Mothers." My kids were ushered to the performance area closest to the parents but farthest away from the sound system, so there were no microphones for them. I encouraged them to yell out the poem but they were hard to hear. At the conclusion of the celebration several mothers of my students approached me with heartfelt thanks and praises. They felt so appreciated, they told me. This made me feel great. But I also felt like I had just helped to commit an emotionally and culturally violent act--how must the Black parents have felt (both those who attended and even those who didn't)? I approached a committee member later that day with questions. I found out that so many presentations were in Spanish because, "that's what people signed up for." The celebration was on that Wednesday and

not Friday (Friday being chronologically closer to what I knew as Mother's Day--Sunday), because that Wednesday was when Mother's Day was celebrated in Mexico. "It just made sense" to schedule it that way, she told me. And as for the disproportionately low number of African-American attendees? "Well," she said shrugging her shoulders, "we invited *everybody. I think it went great! "*

The Mexican Mother's Day incident (as I call it) stood out in the post-227 context in the way that the blackface incident had in1996. Both incidents were major school community events. Both events had been planned as public celebrations of the contributions and histories of particular groups of school community members. And the outcome and meaning of both events was up for interpretation. However, unlike the blackface incident, which became a hotly debated symbol of "what was wrong" for both sides of the "war" in 1996, the Mexican Mother's Day incident did not become a flash point for conflict in 2000. There were no arguments at subsequent faculty meetings, in the lunchroom, or in the parking lot; no controversial apology notes sent home. There was a routine note in the "Special Thanks" portion of our staff weekly bulletin the following Monday recognizing participants and organizers for a great show and that was all I heard about it except for the comments above by one event committee member. Below I discuss school community dynamics post-227, returning later in the chapter to why this event, which *I felt* was emblematic of the cultural citizenship status enjoyed by "Latino/bilingual" school community members and the relative lack thereof by"African-American/EO" school community members, might not have sparked any public debate in the community.

"We were scared!": Impressions of 227 on the "Latino/bilingual" side

Latino/bilingual school community members constructed the post-227 terrain at South Central in varying ways. The majority I spoke with expressed the feeling that 227 was part of state and national cultural trends of anti-immigrationism that demonized and

adversely affected Latinos, bilingualism, immigrants and the Spanish language. They experienced and constructed these as direct cultural and policy attacks, as professional attacks, as racism, and as greed and power grabs. For these reasons, people told me, “Latino/bilingual” students' achievement, their programs and people who served them required extra care and vigilance now more than ever.

227 experienced as attack; immersion and the chaos of implementation as detrimental

Many "Latino/bilingual" school community members explained to me the feeling of coming under policy attack in terms of experiencing an imminent threat on school grounds. One TA told me that right before and after the 227 vote,

> A lot of us were upset... There was a lot of anger and questioning. Nobody knew what to do or what was going to happen.... We didn't know, Can we talk to the kids, can we not talk to the kids [in Spanish]? Are we going to go to jail [if we speak in Spanish]? ... We didn't know if they would have tape recorders in our rooms trying to tape record us. We wondered if they would fire us if we said anything in Spanish. We felt helpless, like we couldn't do anything. We were scared.

I tracked what I interpreted as, in part, a concomitant attack on the cultural capital and power of Latinos/bilingual education proponents in the LAUSD around this time: The superintendent, a Latino and a supporter of bilingual education, came under attack from several sides (though it was never pinned down to one community or another trying to oust him). After months of wrangling it was decided that his contract would be bought out early and a new superintendent installed. Large numbers in the Latino community protested, asserting that the move was an attempt to strip them of power. At the controversy's height petitions were circulated asking the state to take receivership of the District due to the blatantly unfair nature of the move. He was finally bought out. It frequently made the news in English and Spanish, with most coverage highlighting the racial and ethnic tensions that this controversy fueled in the city. Many reports connected

it to the issues of anti-immigrationism and racism against Latinos that also permeated national debates about Propositions 227, 187, and 209.

… and connecting to national trends and discourses

People did feel that our school and district politics articulated to cultural debates nation wide. In the words of one teacher, immigration was the central issue:

> I think California has always had a problem with education. Maybe it has to do with the states down here that have the most immigration--Texas, New Mexico, California. We're always trying to figure out how to meet the needs of these kids. ... Our government doesn't want a lot of immigrants pouring in as we're so close to Mexico. The goal is to keep them out, most of the time. But people come here thinking they're going to have a better life and then they wonder when they feel unwelcome, "What did I do?"

Drawing on national discourses about public education as a tool to level the socio-economic playing field, another teacher reflected similar sentiments as others when he said,

> I think a lot of people were wanting to get rid of Affirmative Action. They felt that it was really helping them [Latinos], you know, get ahead. And I guess we really drove people to vote for 227. And then there's the argument, 'I did it [English sink or swim], why can't they?' Those people had a lot of advantages over these kids.... so they say everyone's equal, and unfortunately I don't believe so. You know these kids start off with a lot of disadvantages. So I don't see how individuals think they can put someone on the same playing field when these kids don't start off with the same opportunities that other kids have. I know I myself didn't have bilingual education [his first language was Spanish] but I had other advantages that these kids don't.

Hence, this teacher like others told me that to level the playing field again, more Spanish language support was needed than we were giving in Model A/Model B. From the perspective of one "African-American/EO" (white) staff member, the fight over 227 and the struggles with its implementation engendered an atmosphere of attack and defense

that she characterized as, "Latino vs. The World, you know like the English-as-first-language population."

It was hard for staff members who were pro-bilingual education not to experience the daily practicalities of 227 policy implementation as an assault on the quality of the academic environment that we had been striving for in the bilingual program. As mentioned in my introductory description of 227 implementation, the term "chaos" was commonly used. One teacher told the story this way:

> I started here in 1992 teaching bilingual. 227, God it was terrible for me. We got nothing [no curricular guidelines, materials] last year. I had to create something from nothing.... I had a bilingual class and in January of last year for 30 days I could not speak Spanish to them and then after 30 days half of my class signed a waiver so I had a half bilingual, half Model B class. It was terrible because you were short-changing the bilingual kids because I had to tone down the Spanish. ... At the beginning of the year certain pro-227 teachers were like, 'Oh this is great, my kids are learning so much English, it's amazing.' And now we are a year later and they're like, 'Oh my got these kids can't read or think for squat!'

Even teachers who retained full bilingual "waivered" classrooms felt that 227 created chaos for them. Amy argued that the push for 227 caused the District to abandon the bilingual education that did survive:

> 227 is terrible. There are no directives, just chaos. And bilingual education here is in chaos, too. There are no directives and the District is not supportive of it, it's phasing it out. The parents want bilingual education here, they're filling out waivers. I think that the waiver is the only way to save our kids, but it's getting harder.

One of my own fieldwork journal entries from February, 1999, my first month of 227, reflects the confusion that we felt as we implemented this drastic, untried program amidst other change going on:

> Things are basically chaos. Today we were talking [at a grade level meeting] about integrating the new [California student learning] standards into our grade level pacing plan, and we do not know if we should do a Spanish/bilingual

> version as well as an English version, and should we do an interim/temporary Immersion version?? Or, how to do it once we decide what to do--and we don't understand how to even decide. Aye.

Enrique lamented to me that with so much general confusion about 227, many bilingual teachers misunderstood the implications of the pedagogical differences between the bilingual and the Immersion programs. This led to grave injustices done to children, he said.

> Many bilingual teachers are misinterpreting 227. They think that it's some kind of advanced program and that waivering a kid to stay in bilingual ed. is like remediation. They are recommending to parents that the 'bright' kids go to Model A or B, and the low kids stay in bilingual. People don't understand what the bilingual program was aiming for, I guess--two languages not just one. So people are not recommending correctly what child might do best in what program. People don't understand the difference between bilingual and Immersion. ... So it's not giving the kids placed in Immersion all the advantages that they deserve and that they otherwise could have access to.... They don't understand the bilingual program and they don't believe in it.

And by the middle of June, 2000 (just weeks before the new school year would start in July) I reflected,

> And the confusion continues. The other day there was just a stack of notices in our boxes to go home to parents about choosing waiver or Model A/Model B for their children next year. And there wasn't even an option on the page for them to choose EO. They did not announce it to us that they were going to put it in our boxes, there was no buildup to how complex and important this choice is. No discussion of the fact that students, according to my understanding of the legislation, were supposed to have one year of English Immersion and a second year if the first year did not get them redesignated. This is now going to be the third year. And [the Bilingual Coordinator] continues to tell me that he has heard nothing, "zero," no discussion about what should happen after that. I guess Proposition 227 is now not being paid attention to fully--or let me say, the time aspect of it is being ignored. The District is acting like this has always been their program, that there is nothing wrong with doing this selection of programs last-

> minute and with no other information. Only three of my students' parents even asked for more information or advice. Everyone else just signed to paper like, "Whatever, *maestra*." It's like nobody knows where we're going and nobody cares.

Indeed, in the fall of 2000 a bilingual-turned Immersion teacher confided in me that he never understood the dictates of 227 or how it related to other programs:

> I don't know why people voted for 227. ... Was it vote yes for 227 or vote no [for bilingual education advocates]? And 'no' was to not have… [pauses, gives the questioning look]? I never understood it. ... I've never really discussed with other teachers whether they think the program is helping the kids or not. I'm not really sure of the difference between the programs. Are we doing it right?

The chaos created by 227 was only compounded by the fact that 1998 was a time of drastic reform in education in California in general: Bilingual education foes had long bemoaned a perceived lack of data to show results of the program and a seemingly lack of accountability. This concern hit education writ large at this time, and states across the nation began enacting strict accountability plans based on mandatory data collection and analysis. In California the Stanford 9 test was implemented and we began to hear about possible "consequences" if our scores did not improve. State student learning standards (for English Language Arts, English Language Development and other content areas) were instituted. Additionally, in the LAUSD the long-common practice of social promotion was limited. During all this the District was undergoing its leadership crisis, with multiple superintendents and plans for breaking up the district. At one point in the winter of 1998 I heard from a colleague who was well-connected to District higher-ups that the turmoil was causing "all of the big decisions to be totally put off until the controversy's over. All big decisions are at a standstill."

In such an environment we didn't know who had the answers, nor sometimes even what our questions should be in order to bring some order to the chaos.

"They got what they wanted" but "African-Americans/EO's" seen as causing more conflict because of greed and culture

Even though many people felt the environment on campus was chaotic and hostile to bilingual education and Latinos at this time, a few confided in me the opinion that the "war" *should* have ended with the implementation of 227 because it largely removed *the* issue (or the policy mandate for it) in that conflict--the bilingual program. Explained Linda, "The Black teachers don't have anything to complain about now, they got what they wanted. We're all using English." But, she said, "some EO's still like to whip up the race politics--I don't know why, we are all doing English!"

Many explained that money as a resource and as an expression of value in the community continued fuel the race politics. A TA opined, "Some EO people are still complaining. It just has to do with greed, with people wanting what other people have. They just want the bilingual resources." And while we all knew that large sums of money were still spent on materials in Spanish and materials designed specifically for ESL, two staff members I interviewed sounded just like those in 1996 who argued that even so, "African-American/EO" students benefited from plenty of materials while "Latino/bilingual" students still did not receive their deserved share: Said one, "They said that the Spanish kids get everything but what do you mean? You go into the IMC [Instructional Materials Room, where educational games, etc. were stored] and *everything* is in English and I'm like, what are you talking about, what school are *you* going to?" Our Title I Coordinator in 2000 told me,

> Teaching English to native speakers is not the same thing as teaching Immersion to English Learners, and I think we need special techniques, we need special materials, we need special staff development. We still need specialized everything and I think there's still a bit of that resentment from the EO teachers that we even need those things; that we can say as bilingual educators, 'Well, you know, I cannot use those materials with my English Learners. I need such and such and such.' You know? I think they resent that because they know we're still buying those materials for our kids, still spending the money.

And in the summer of 2000 another teacher added,

> The teachers who teach the EO kids, I think they think that all the money is going toward the special programs to accommodate [the English Learners], whether it be the ESL program and materials that we got or now that the school has done things to change, like there is now a universal ESL time. During 1:00 to 1:40 the entire school teaches ESL. So at first we would hear complaints from the EO teachers. They would ask, 'Well what are we supposed to be doing during this time?' Well, my opinion was that those EO students they still need help anyway. They benefit from ESL regardless because their writing is still very poor....

Usually omitted in these staff members' accounts of "African-American/EO" school community members' greed was the coveting of the at-risk bilingual stipends by some "Latino/bilingual" teachers (I discuss this below). Indeed it seemed that the competition for a piece of the (insufficient) pie and the social capital that this represented in the community still raged across a "Latino/bilingual" versus "African-American/EO" line.

Discourses of culture still played an important, though smaller, role in school community politics post-227. Overall I heard much less talk about culture as a dividing force in the school community, but a few of the "Latino/bilingual" school community members who constructed a picture of enduring conflict did cite differences in culture as one cause. A staff member explained it this way:

> I think that there are many, many, many socioeconomic factors that enter into the African-American family structure in this community that does not happen in the Latino community and this causes problems. ... I think there is a large population of single mothers, it's more rampant in the African-American community. And I also think drug use is more, you know, widely used. I think that alcoholism is a problem in both communities but it seems to me that the fact that the African-American grandparent is the parent, um, I think that I see people that have come to know the system. You know the Latino community, the immigrants, they come here to work. They really don't, you know, use the social services like welfare.

Almost identically to school community members in 1996, this staff member draws on the culture of poverty discourses about dysfunctional families (and poverty-perpetuating

lifestyles passed along family lines), and about withdraw from the American mainstream ideal of hard work leading to success. A parent of one of my students responded similarly to my question about relations between Black and Latino parents, highlighting the culture of poverty tenet of laziness (translation mine): "We Latinos are doing well. The Black people don't like us. They don't want to come and work in the meetings. I don't know why. They don't want to get together with Latinos." I responded, "I have heard that some parent meetings and workshops are presented in Spanish with no translation. Might their lack of involvement have to do with language?" "It doesn't have to do with language," she said:

> They do a lot of stuff in English and I don't speak English but I come to meetings. It's not language. The school is all of ours. ... They say we are taking over the school but they don't come. They don't support anything, they don't help with anything.... They [school administration] treat us well, they have good meetings, beautiful meetings. I think we have a great principal now. He listens to us.

I followed with the question, "Do you think Black and Latino children get an equal quality of education here?" "Yes, they all do," she stated, "but they [African-American parents] don't want to work as hard. We are out working at jobs, to make $200 a day. They aren't."

A TA also described the ongoing conflict to me as caused by African-Americans' refusal to participate in today's ever-more diverse local and national culture. She argued, "There are a lot of Black parents that get upset about the number of Latinos here. But this is a new world, we are living together. If you want to go to an all-Black school you should go look for Martin Luther King. We have to deal with all kinds of people now. Get used to it. This is the real world."

<u>… and connecting to national level trends and discourses</u>

As these people connected school community politics to, on the one hand, African-Americans' cultural dysfunction, lack of participation in the economic mainstream, laziness and even an anachronistic pre-Civil Rights-era culture; and on the

other hand to Latinos' work ethic, up-and-coming socioeconomic status and participation in the increasingly-diverse cultural climate, they articulated their position to powerful media discourses of the time. As mentioned in the post-227 media chapter, it was hard to pick up a newspaper, watch the TV news, or listen to the radio from 1998 to 2000 without finding stories about radical demographic and attendant economic and cultural changes nationwide. Latino immigrants were finding more and more inroads to jobs previously abandoned by American workers, many of whom had been African-American. Latino culture(s) and the Spanish language were changing industries, governments, schools, social norms and whole communities small and large. The 2000 census revealed that Latinos surpassed African-Americans as the largest minority in the nation and that Garcia was the most common name of new homeowners in some cities; Latinos were often portrayed as the new “American Dream makers.”

So while discourses about culture were not as common at South Central Elementary post-227 as they were pre-227, I did get the sense that for those who employed them they provided a compelling rationale that granted legitimacy on the national scene for why “African-American/EO” school community members "still caused" conflict and why things could be just fine if "they" would "just work hard" and assimilate to the new "real world," which the media reminded us was ever-more Latino.

Whose knowledge is of most worth?

Now that English For the Children was in effect there seemed to be an uncertainty for many bilingual and bilingual-turned-English Immersion teachers about their worth and their skills. We still used our Spanish-language skills with the students in the Model A and Model B classes (though, granted, to a lesser extent than before), and we still used Spanish with the parents. So many teachers felt that their worth was being devalued by the fact that the long-standing bilingual stipend was under attack. At both our school and in the District, people questioned its legitimacy. The teachers union went into negotiations with the District about the stipend's future and no one knew how long it might last.

In response, some teachers expressed resentment. More than one put it like this new teacher, as he discussed what should happen in the future:

> I think the school and teachers and the District should have to see what is in the best interest of the kids. And for me, I hate to even say it, but the money, too! It bothers me that I'm getting my credential in bilingual, I'm getting BCLAD [Bilingual, Cross-cultural, Language and Academic Development specialist certificate--required to get the full $5000 stipend] and I might not get paid for it. So then there is no benefit for me being able to discuss with the parents, write my own letters home. I could just speak to them in English if I wanted. I just feel like I might not get paid for my services.

Other teachers took a "get it while you can" attitude. "I have eight students who are on grade level in English," admitted Linda at a meeting of grade level chairpeople, "but I'm not telling anyone they are ready to redesignate [out of Limited English Proficient status] yet, because then I wouldn't have enough LEP students in my class to get my stipend, and I want it." As other teachers listened, some (including me) with wide looks of surprise, she continued, "I'll tell their next year's teacher that they are ready. They can redesignate then. But I want my stipend this year." And so emerged the competing, contradictory motivations for Immersion teachers: On the one hand there was the policy pressure to bring students to English fluency as soon as possible. On the other hand there was the economic pressure to maintain students' LEP status long enough to get one's stipend. This sentiment, either heard or suspected by “African-American/EO” school community members, became very controversial. (I will return to this moment in the next chapter.)

Most "Latino/bilingual" teachers I spoke with argued along with the pro-bilingual education stories in the media that a major flaw of 227 advocates was that they did not possess the appropriate professional knowledge to decide what programmatic reforms were necessary to meet the needs of English Learners. In the words of one South Central teacher, "The people who felt that 227 was good" were "all English-speaking teachers. They didn't have a bilingual classroom and they didn't know anything about bilingual

students and what their needs are." Only a few bilingual-turned-English Immersion teachers even mentioned the experience that EO teachers had in teaching content area knowledge in English as a body of knowledge that they might tap into. Remember the quote from earlier, “Teaching English to native speakers is not the same thing as teaching Immersion to English Learners… We still need specialized everything…”

Another teacher, talking about professional collaboration post-227, mentioned two white EO teachers as colleagues she had learned ESL techniques from. Wondering how race played into this opinion, I asked if Janice was a teacher such as these, who possessed ESL knowledge she might draw upon. "No, Janice has Black kids, she never has to transition them." Interesting, that "having Black kids" was meant to signify that you had no knowledge of how to work with English Learners in English. Not only was Janice teaching a mixed EO/*Immersion* class that year; she had taught and redesignated English Learners in her EO and English transition-level bilingual classes in the past. And, the two white EO teachers mentioned as knowledgeable also "had Black kids" in their class that year.

Here we can see that race--both the race of the students and the teacher--overrode program participation as a factor in people's assumptions about the knowledge others had and its value. African-American seemed to continue to denote EO and only EO. Even though now more than before faculty members of all colors had sets of knowledge and skills that were useful across programs, race continued to bolster division between who was seen to be knowledgeable and "on one's side."

Other impressions: 227 seen as resolving the conflict

Amongst others’ talk of attack, conflict and chaos, a few "Latino/bilingual" school community members presented me with a different picture of the post-227 terrain. They portrayed the lines between racial-linguistic communities on campus as dissolving: Out of all the people I spoke with over those two years, six on this side told me at one point or another that they thought Proposition 227 resolved the conflict of 1996. With one stroke of the policy pen, they told me, the focus on English changed division and

exclusion to unity and inclusion, and improved "Latino/bilingual" students' attainment of English.

Interestingly, three of these six people were white. On her part Linda argued that, quite simply, "English, English, English has us all in the same boat and we get along better now because of that." Showing a change of heart in her policy stance (she had been a vociferous advocate for bilingual education pre-227), she even maintained at one point that the teachers who still had waivered bilingual classes were "doing a disservice" to the students by going against the direction of the rest of the school, district and state. Andrea explained the shift towards English as encouraging a mending of fences this way:

> There was a push in the past to hire bilingual staff members and that caused problems. But now we're hiring everybody, despite their language abilities. We still need bilingual teachers but we also need teachers who are good monolingual English teachers. I have personally hired a number of good African-American teachers. I think many of the people who were disgruntled racially, including many of the Ed Aides, we have gotten to know each other better. They can see we're moving in a positive direction, that we are including all people.

The third white school community member who maintained that conflict had diminished said that it did so because her "Latino/bilingual" colleagues could no longer argue to save bilingual education in the face of new data showing gains in Limited English Proficient students' test scores. She said,

> I believe in bilingual education when it's done right. I've taught transition [bilingual] classes, but I don't think that the way the District has done it has been done well. I think that [the implementation of 227] went really well... When the Stanford 9 results came back [from last year, our first year of 227] and we had higher scores, I think that shut a lot of [anti-227] people up because they really couldn't argue with the fact that students were performing better. Kids are learning English now. I don't hear a lot about bilingual education anymore.

Both these white and Latino staff members who told me that 227 was good for South Central Elementary shared a similar evaluation of the English Immersion program based on their personal experiences--two teachers even used exactly the same words to

answer my question, "How is 227 going in your classroom?" They said, "Oh my God my kids are learning so much English! It's so great! I'm so surprised!" Seeing that their students did not fall apart in an immersion setting as some had predicted was proof enough, they told me, that English for the Children was OK, maybe even better than bilingual education. For some, even the chaos of implementation and the confusion about what Proposition 227 should look like in practice seemed to defuse conflict across the "Latino/bilingual-African-American/EO" line. For example, one colleague confided, "My kids are learning so much English! I guess we weren't expecting enough of them in bilingual education! Now I see the EO point of view--just teach English and they learn!" (I wondered like Enrique if these experienced teachers ever taught ESL in their *bi*lingual classrooms, where the goal of the District's program was to build upon first language literacy in order to transition students into EO classrooms as fast as possible.)

Two of the three Latino teachers who described the previous conflict to me as "over now" presented fractured arguments, in contrast to their white counterparts whose positions, described above, were more one-sided. At one point they described the current situation similarly to their white counterparts--i.e., “We're all concentrating on English now, we're united around a shared goal. It’s good!” However, they both said *emphatically* later in their interviews that if they could have it their way, we "would have more bilingual education." And even as Enrique (who always maintained a pro-bilingual education agenda in our discussions) told me that race and language divisions still existed at South Central, he made an important point about dynamics of cultural citizenship: He suggested that some of the tensions might have lessened because 227 redistributed voice, value, representation and access to the power structure to the “African-American/EO” community. He reflected, "227 was almost like a safety valve. By its passing it relieved a lot of the aggression from the people who were fighting the bilingual program. So they were kind of like, 'Whew! Now we're winning.'"

Agendas for the future within local and national contexts

Save bilingual education

Of the "Latino/bilingual" school community members who characterized 227 as a destructive policy development and the “war” as ongoing, several upheld the call to save bilingual education. They articulated their stance to pro-bilingual education discourses in media, stressing the need for people to be successful participants in an increasingly-diverse world, and the need to save them from the closed-minded EO movement. They also maintained their support for the research (and their own experience) behind successful transition bilingual programs--which showed the effectiveness of teaching students content in their native language while simultaneously teaching them ESL and transitioning them to English Only instruction when their language skills were sufficient.

One teacher described his experience of the 30 days mandatory 100% English at the beginning of 227 and then his switch back to the bilingual program after parents signed waivers as one of unnecessary frustration: "It was frustrating because my kids, I knew what they could do [in Spanish]. 227 was a joke, we were finger painting and doing ESL all day. The fact that I'm doing it [the bilingual program] now, it's nice you know. It made me feel better to take them back so that they didn't get totally lost."

Teachers who still hoped to save bilingual education were clear that the effort now rested on *individuals* willing to swim against the powerful (and hostile) English Immersion stream. While the administration provided parents basic information on all of their programmatic options, it was individual teachers who spoke with individual parents about their recommendations for individual students--and always while under pressure to give "advice," not "advocacy." One teacher put it this way:

> There are a few teachers who really know what they're doing and who have successful programs and who were able to convince--that is professionally advise--parents that it would be good for their children to keep them in bilingual ed. for the rest of their primary education. So there are still a good number of classes that will be fully bilingual and that actually will probably do well.

Amy told her own story of resistance this way: She actively sought out parents to discuss the benefits of a waiver because,

> I think bilingual education's great. I was involved with the anti-227 and the anti-187 and -209 effort in L.A.. It's all so scary. ... The parents want bilingual education here, they're filling out waivers. My whole class is waivered. I think that the waiver is the only way to save our kids. I am protecting them, keeping them ahead. They will get ahead in this multilingual world with bilingual education. My kids are doing great.

It was not just people who saw English Immersion as a destructive force on campus who hoped to save bilingual education, however. One of the Latino teachers above who shared with me his opinion that 227 had had a positive effect on the community, then justified a seemingly-contradictory pro-bilingual education agenda by citing the negative, anti-Latino national trend that he hoped to counter: Directly connecting to dynamics of race/ism which are so entwined in American public discourse about Affirmative Action, he explained (quoted earlier), "I think a lot of people were wanting to get rid of Affirmative Action. They felt that it [bilingual education] was really helping them [Latinos], you know, get ahead. And I guess we really drove people to vote for 227." So despite lessening tensions on campus due to 227, were he to have his way he would reinstate "more bilingual education."

In this instance we may be seeing another moment when the "Black-Brown" aspect of community tensions became more salient than the "EO-bilingual" aspect. Bilingual education as a social agenda, seen as an Affirmative Action program of sorts, for Latinos was accorded more weight than the unifying force of English Immersion on campus in this teacher's agenda formation process. The racial and the linguistic (as tied to programmatic) seem like Siamese twins—inseparable, one grand organism although with two separate identities and abilities to act upon the world in independent ways. Again we see the context shaping the ways in which this dynamic plays out: In the local context 227 is seen as a positive policy force, and praised. In the national context bilingual education is advocated, each for good reasons. That white "Latino/bilingual"

school community members who felt that 227 was a good thing did not also continue to harbor a future agenda for bilingual education may speak to the general remove that white staff members still claimed in the community—they did not feel connected to the narrow “Black-Brown” aspect of community tensions and so easily disconnected from the racially-oriented civil rights aspect of the agenda for bilingual education on the national scale.

Stick with 227

For the few others who argued that English For the Children ended the "war" at South Central Elementary (they were all white and one Latino), the answer to my question, "If you could dictate our educational policy in the future, what would you do?" was clear: continue with English Immersion. These people explained their support for this agenda in strikingly similar terms: In the words of one colleague, since Immersion students were "learning so much English!" and 227 was "the way everybody's going," we "should stick with it."

Reflections on policy: The power of ch(v)oice in cultural citizenship

A key finding of my post-227 research emerged when three "Latino/bilingual" school community members expressed a sentiment about English Immersion that mirrored that of many "African-American/EO" school community members about bilingual education in 1996. *They did not bristle against 227 as a policy itself but against their perceived lack of voice in the policy planning and implementation process.* Our bilingual teacher-turned Title I coordinator explained to me that in 1998,

> With the vote for 227 approaching, there was disbelief on the part of bilingual teachers that the measure would pass. We just didn't think it could go. And so when the votes came in I guess also we thought that it would be dismissed, that we would fight it in court like Prop 187... But because we knew it was on the ballot, because we knew what was going on, I think that there came a time when we realized that in fact we were doing a poor job of developing the children's English language. We focused so much on the Spanish--our kids were beautifully

> literate. They could write a three-page paper in the third grade. But we did not have the resources or the staff development or the energy at the end of the day to teach *English* Language Development. So there was a moment when we recognized our fault and said, 'Hey, the reason this is on the ballot is because we--this, this has been lacking. So we are going to do a better job of it now.' So we started teaching more English even before the vote came to pass.... I started teaching math in English. ... *We hated 227 but I think slowly we have come to see that teaching in English to these children really, it's kind of a good thing. It really is what's best. What we resented was the form and the haphazard manner in which it was all just given to us.* How can someone who's never been in the classroom write some stupid law and tell us what to do in our classroom?

Another teacher put it this way:

> It wasn't a matter of getting rid of bilingual education, just of implementing it correctly. I know it was not perfect in our school but that is because teachers didn't implement it correctly. It was disgusting... 227 wasn't implemented, it was just told. Some people I knew decided, 'What are they going to do, come in my room and count the minutes I teach in English vs. Spanish?' It's kind of like, when the door closes, it's my room. They resented people trying to tell them what to teach.

When I heard these reflections I was immediately struck—I had heard these sentiments before. They sounded just like "African-American/EO" school community members in 1996 who, like Janice, explained to me the inner complexities of their anti-bilingual education stance this way (recalling a quote from the pre-227 chapter):

> I know there's a need for bilingual education. People don't know this but I have studied bilingual education, I know the theory. I see it work at this school and I agree with it in principle. But I don't support [it] here because of how it was pushed on us. We got no say and suddenly we were second-class citizens in our own school…

Here we see what I believe to be a crux of the conflict at South Central Elementary: Choice and voice in the policy process as a key component of people's sense of cultural citizenship (and, hence, key to their full, collaborative and productive participation in the school community). Defining cultural citizenship as *both the process*

and outcomes of how a community defines itself, its interests and purpose, its binding solidarities, its boundaries, its membership and its voice (Flores and Benmayor 1997:13) enables exploration of the way in which people understand and construct reality; how they negotiate their relationships and roles as they shape the distribution of rights and claim belonging, entitlement, dignity and access to institutional power structures. For these school community members it was not the technical *Policy* of English Immersion--or earlier, bilingual education--itself that they objected to. They resented that they felt it was *forced upon them (the process)* and that it *robbed them of their voice and agency (the outcome).*

As Shore and Wright (1997) and Urciuoli (1996) might argue, the Policy as document was less an issue than the policy as contested cultural resource in the negotiation of daily social, professional and academic life. It was the pragmatics of it that gave it its meaning in practice: English for the Children became like bilingual education before it-- *an educational language policy context within which (or a cultural artifact through which)* politics of change, power, belonging, access to cultural capital, race, fairness, competition and equity were negotiated.

"Latino/bilingual," me

I myself also perceived English for the Children in many of the complex ways that other "Latino/bilingual" school community members did. It felt to me like an assault on all that I knew about language acquisition and good pedagogy for second language learners. It felt like a cultural attack on Latinos, immigrants, language minority communities, and proponents of diversity and equity everywhere. But hearing others talk about it made me realize how far we had to go to make bilingual instruction as strong as it was meant to be. Finding out that many bilingual teachers rarely taught ESL and that some considered it a remedial program compared to Models A and B was shocking. I came to believe that as much as I detested Ron Unz, his motives and tactics, *raising questions* about bilingual education in the late 1990s had been necessary. But I also believe that largely gutting the program without addressing its instructional and curricular

issues in favor of a poorly designed, untried, haphazardly-implemented immersion program was wrong.

And I also I strongly agreed with the "African-American/EO" school community members who still advocated for dual language bilingual instruction for all students I still hitched my star to the goal of full participation by *all* in the increasingly-diverse linguistic, cultural and economic spaces of South Central Los Angeles and the United States. As I discuss in the Activist Anthropology chapter, I hoped that the activist component of my project could provide one forum for hearing voices from all sectors of the school community around where we had been, where we were, and where we were going. I strongly believed that we still had to address the disparities in student achievement between "Latino/bilingual" and "African-American/EO" students, and feelings of a lack of cultural citizenship on the part of "African-American/EO" adults.

As I have also tried to show, my perceptions about Proposition 227 and those of other "Latino/bilingual" school community members never became fodder for a continued all-out "war," however. While tensions remained they generated what felt more like dispersed skirmishes than a war. I believe that this is because there was a kind of resignation after the 1998 ballot measure. It had passed and it hadn't gone to court and been dismissed like Proposition 187. There didn't seem to be anything we could do about it except work within it. Now the quest to save bilingual education was an individual endeavor undertaken by teachers and individual parents who signed waiver requests. In the post-227 terrain there didn't seem to be ground for an offensive (or even a vigorous defensive) stance on language education policy. 227 was here to stay.

Simultaneously there seemed to be a realization that in spite of this perceived policy/cultural/programmatic attack, even with a frontal assault on "Latino/bilingual" cultural citizenship statewide with 227, *where "Latino/bilingual" school community members stood in the local school community vis-à-vis their "African-American/EO " counterparts did not seem to have changed:* Latinos were still the overwhelming and growing majority at South Central Elementary. Latino English Learners still received the benefit of the majority of the school's materials and personnel resources (even if it wasn't

yet perceived as enough). Several people, even after describing to me struggles against the perceived attack of English For the Children, still concluded reflections on school community dynamics like this teacher: "It seems like the school is trying to do the best thing for the kids. They're trying to follow procedure and do what L.A. Unified wants us to do... I believe the school has the kids' best interest in mind, the people who make decisions about what's happening here." …And a Mother's Day celebration with music and presentations almost exclusively in Spanish could still take place (and on *Mexican* Mother's Day at that) and nary a complaint would be lodged.

Impressions of 227 on the "African-American/EO" side

"African-American/EO" school community members painted a similarly varied picture of the post-227 terrain at South Central Elementary as their "Latino/bilingual" counterparts. Most maintained that the 1996 "war" still raged, and they generally cited the following points of contention: a lack of concern for, respect for and resources for "African-American/EO" children and adults; misuse of policy against "African-Americans/EO's"; racism; and unfair moves to maintain money and power by Latinos/bilinguals.

"Things are still the same": racism, policy abuse, a lack of concern for, respect for and resources for "African-American/EO" children and adults, greed and lack of representation in the power structure

Most African-American/EO school community members that I spoke with over the two years shared with me the opinion that (if they were new) there was great division on our campus and (if they had been around since the mid-1990s) that, "Things are still the same." The major reason people cited for continued conflict was a lack of concern for, respect for and resources for Black children and adults, in favor of the "Latino/bilingual" community. Regarding children, that "African-American/EO" students continued to score below their "Latino/bilingual" counterparts on many

assessment measures, and that this did not seem to be a major public concern on campus seemed proof enough. I heard stories similar to this teacher's on many occasions:

> I have heard, I'm not going to say only from Latino teachers or white teachers, but from teachers, that they don't think there's a problem, um, they see that, [sighs] it's hard to say. [Sighs] For example the Stanford 9. They see that the Hispanic kids are scoring higher than the Black kids. And it was asked, 'Do you really think it's a problem?' And this person said they really didn't think it was a problem. I'm serious, Kim. I'm not going to even tell you who said it but I heard it. It's awful. They don't see it. [I interject: Don't even tell me it's an administrator who said that.] It was. And they're in a position of leadership, Kim, they set the tone. It's awful.

The achievement gap between African-American and Latino students at South Central Elementary was an issue for the District, also. As mentioned earlier, a major conclusion of the school's Program Quality Review in 1999 was the need to narrow this gap. Our EO students, we were told, were scoring below the 10th percentile on the Stanford 9 test, while the Latino students who were transitioning into English Only were scoring in the 60th and 70th percentile; and our bilingual program students were scoring very high on the Aprenda (Spanish-language standardized test). In my field notes I recorded a discussion of this topic at a meeting of my grade level teachers:

> After this was reported to us, a colleague asked [our grade level chairperson], 'Really? Is that so? Why?'--almost like 'wow...' but more out of shock than concern. The only thing our chairperson said in response was, 'We have to narrow the gap.' That was it. No action steps were mentioned. No one else asked questions. The only person who even took notes was me.

I reflect upon this moment again in the Action Anthropology chapter.

The academic achievement of "African-American/EO" students was not the only part of their growth that people were concerned with. Many charged that African-American students were culturally marginalized at our school. For example, in February

of 1999 Michael shared with me his objections to how students were grouped on tracks in the year-round schedule:

> The majority of the Black children are on one track [A], which doesn't make sense to me. Not only am I going to say it looks bad, it is bad. I mean this is Black History Month. When we're talking about the Black heritage, they're off-track! So who's listening?... I must admit that I felt, I feel this now too, it seems there is much more emphasis on bilingual education as opposed to EO education because the majority of the school is Hispanic.

Janice told me, "I have tons of materials on African-American History Month and Kwanzaa that I put in people's boxes. No one asks me about it. No one even uses it." And another teacher stated,

> We're still dealing with racial issues. I've heard bilingual teachers say that they don't want to teach 'those kids,' 'those' African-American kids. They're scared. It's racism any day of the week but people don't want to address it. It's just too hot of an issue and people might get a chance to vent their frustrations and then what? Our administrators have steered away from it because it is still seen as a hot button issue--you're going to scratch the surface of it and aaaaah [sarcastically]!

Regarding adults on campus, a few people pointed out to me that just looking at our administration told the story: Our principal and vice principal were white and known to be very pro-bilingual, and after Roslyn left our Title I and Bilingual Coordinators were Latino (and, soon after, a new Bilingual Coordinator who was white was elected). Experiences of personal and professional marginalization and disregard were plentiful. Eleanor told me that the principal set the tone for this. She recalled,

> [The principal] did not speak to us in the hall. I questioned him about this, I brought it to his attention and he has tried to be better but it's not right. And some teachers, [names two Latino teachers] only started speaking to us around Christmas but their looks are like, 'What are you doing here? You don't need to be here.'

And, she continued,

> I have asked for supplies before but they won't give me the key to the supply room. But they have these kids who come in off the street to help [high school volunteers who are on vacation who work in the office… not volunteers in the tutoring program] who they don't *know* and they give *them* the key. Enrique once would not give me the keys, he asked [a Latino TA] to take me up to the room. It's like, I don't want this stuff! ... What is it that you are trying to keep away from somebody? South Central has never been this way. This is not South Central. It's not supposed to be this way, we are all grown-up and supposed to be professional, we're supposed to love the kids. It's still like, 'The more Hispanics we get in here the better it's going to be for us.'... You [referring to herself] don't say anything because you really don't have a word [a voice], but [looks away, does not continue]…

Another teacher added to this experience of not having a voice in the community the perception that "African-American/EO" people are not even part *of* the community: "You know when I walk into the cafeteria and they're speaking in English they switch to Spanish and stuff like that. I mean, you feel neglected. You feel like what you say isn't important. You don't feel *a part of*." I reflected on feeling this dynamic (I felt similar to how I felt during the "Mexican Mothers Day" incident) in my field notes in June, 2000:

> We had the Juneteenth celebration on the 17th. I noticed that Monday morning during the assembly announcements [held each Monday, the whole school is present], [the principal] only mentioned it briefly, saying that if students did not know what Juneteenth was they 'should ask their teachers.' That was it. He did not say anything about why it was important or anything. And our 'celebration' was only a pot luck lunch for the staff. No school wide program or celebration for students and parents. At the Cinco de Mayo celebration, which was huge and for everybody, we had a review of the history and why it was important at the beginning of the program. For Juneteenth it was up to individual teachers to address the topic in class. The students -- we all -- got short changed, I feel.

Parent representation and inclusion had been a challenge for South Central Elementary since I had first worked there. The task of meeting everyone's language needs, for instance, always had to be carefully planned. Our Bilingual Coordinator told me the following story in 1999, which for me and for others crystallized the "African-American/EO" side's argument that Black school community members were systematically denied full cultural citizenship. Several months earlier, he told me, the

District sent representatives to the campus to run a parent training institute (as is done cyclically at most schools). The principal was on vacation that week, and "he had not told any of the other administrators at the school that the meeting was scheduled. So all of a sudden that morning the auditorium was filled with parents and it was crazy." He (the Bilingual Coordinator) was sent on a run to procure some refreshments and then to represent the administration at the institute. The presenters began speaking in Spanish, he told me, when African-American parents asked what they were supposed to do to understand. The presenters responded, he told me, "by telling them to go to *the back* of the auditorium where they could receive translation." The "translator" ended up being just one of the bilingual parents who happened to be in attendance (this person had not come prepared to translate). People were furious and left. At the next institute, the presenters tried to compensate for their blunder by moving the African-American parents to the front, which, in the South Central auditorium, meant up on the stage--and to many this implied, "*behind* the curtain." Since then, the Coordinator told me, "not a single African-American parent has come back for a parent institute."

These kinds of experiences led to pressure from some to rethink the way the administration provided for parent representation in community life: Just like in 1996 the race of the school's official parent representative became an issue. The school's LEARN Council (a general decision-making and budget committee) had the power to hire a parent to coordinate trainings and meetings for the community. They took up the question. The makeup of the Council varied over time and depended on which tracks were on but a typical roster (from March, 1999) included 7 teachers--3 Latino, 1 Black, and 3 white (including Linda); one classified employee representative (African-American, Michael); 2 parent members, both Latina; and the (white) principal. Of the employee members, 2 were from the EO program, 5 were from the bilingual and/or English Immersion programs, and the principal was widely considered to favor "Latino/bilingual" concerns. Some members of the LEARN Council felt that having one parent representative was sufficient. The current parent representative was a Latina, and they argued that she could effectively reach out to both communities, Latino and African-American. Some

members, the most vocal of whom was Michael, felt that two representatives were necessary, one to reach out to each community.

For months the Council was deadlocked. Apparently at one point when it began to look like more people would vote for having only one representative, Michael charged, "Well, I guess that's how you treat niggers at this school." But by May of 2000 when the Council still could not come to consensus they tabled the discussion. "It looks like we will just keep [the current Latina representative], for now" one member told me. "We will just talk to her to make sure she tries to reach out to everybody." The principal told me that he was conflicted about the issue; he could see both arguments. In the end he said that if he had his own way he would institute two representatives. It "would be a nice gesture" towards the African-American community, he said. I wondered what good a "gesture" would do when serious issues of cultural citizenship were on the table. Late into the summer of 2000, after my research had ended, I still had not heard that the decision had been made.

In addition to these charges of racism, lack of concern for the academic and social growth of "African-American/EO" students, and lack of regard for "African-American/EO" adults, many charged “Latino/bilingual” school community members with blatant bias--even cheating--in the implementation of Proposition 227. One teacher explained the cheating in terms of improper "advocacy" (not "advice") about the bilingual program waivers:

> I have spoken to teachers who are not bilingual teachers and they are very angry. Proposition 227 is not being implemented.... I am angry that several people who, although they were told not to coerce their parents, they did so anyway.

She chalked this advocacy up to greed, continuing:

> They just want to keep their bilingual benefits. They persuaded the parents to do the alternative, the waiver. I think it is a disservice to the children because a lot of those children are speaking English very well. My feeling is, I'll do anything to help a kid. But when it hinges on the fact that I'm not going to have a job because there are only bilingual positions then you are messing with my livelihood.

Another charge of policy abuse surfaced in questions about the use of Spanish in Immersion classrooms. Enrique told me at one point that as much misunderstanding as there was amongst bilingual staff about the Model A/B programs vis-à-vis the bilingual program, there was even more amongst EO teachers and aides. He said that even though he thought he had made everyone aware of the sanctioned (limited) use of Spanish in the Immersion rooms, "They still asked me, 'Why are people still using Spanish with the kids? Isn't that illegal now? We have 227 and we should be teaching in English. Why are people cheating?'" A teacher expressed this assertion of policy abuse to me as such:

> I think that the reason 227 isn't helping the politics here is because teachers like yourself might be implementing it, Kim, but I don't think that everyone is implementing it. [I ask, "What makes you think that?"] I think they're still doing it Kim, I think they're still teaching in Spanish. … I was never really in a class where that bilingual stuff was going on. I don't know what you guys were doing. I don't know if you were teaching in Spanish all day long, half the day, part of the day, I don't know. But my partner teacher next store I *still* hear him all the time speaking in Spanish! He's writing in Spanish, the kids are speaking to him in Spanish. If he's doing it behind closed doors I think other teachers are doing it behind closed doors.

The partner teacher she was referring to, I happened to know that he had a waivered bilingual class that year. But in the early days things were so chaotic that it really was hard for everyone to tell who was doing what, who should be doing what, and hence who might be doing something wrong.

Another abuse of policy that I heard about on more than one occasion from Janice was the perceived refusal of the Bilingual Coordinator to process the paperwork to officially redesignate students from Limited English Proficient to Redesignated Fluent English Proficient (RFEP). In early spring, 2000 I was working in my role as Standards-Based Assessment Coordinator, helping teachers prepare for the upcoming Performance Assessments. We had to confirm which students were and were not English Learners, as only students fluent in English officially took the test. Janice pointed out students on her roster whom I had not considered eligible for the test but who she said were because she considered them to be redesignated. She said that she had told Enrique that those

students needed to be reclassified on the computer but, "It's a joke. These kids have *been* redesignated. I have been waiting since last year for them to change this. It's a joke." And at another Performance Assignment meeting three other EO teachers and I sat, shocked, listening to Linda basically confirm suspicions that some version of "cheating" was going on--recall her statement quoted earlier when she exclaimed that she would not report the fact that she had students ready to redesignate because she wanted to maintain enough "LEP's" on her roster to receive her bilingual stipend (the minimum is one-third of the class).

An abuse of sound instructional practice that many mentioned was the perceived flat-out neglect of the instructional resource needs of "African-American/EO" students. Elizabeth shared with me at one point that EO teachers...

> are on fire! Racial tensions have not gone away. Black students are still treated totally differently, and Latino kids are still favored.... For *years* we [EO teachers] pleaded with the administration to get us phonics materials and they never did. Well, now with 227, now that *Latino* kids have to learn English, we're getting more phonics books than we know what to do with. The Black kids weren't important enough on their own to buy it for. ... And then when you go to the upper grades many of our EO's just aren't reading on grade level. So what happens is you lump them in with the kids who are just learning English, using their story books, using their phonics books, and we really don't know if it meets the needs of the EO kids. But that's what we do because that's the resources we have.

Looking at budget figures proposed for 2000-2001 one could see this discrepancy in numbers. While huge sums of money--tens and tens of thousands of dollars--were allocated for instructional resources for school wide use (for example, the phonics materials mentioned above) or specifically for English Learners (ESL materials), only $3000 were set aside for material specifically geared for EO students (the Proficiency in English Program, PEP, a language development program for non-standard English speakers). While "African-American/EO" students were certainly a smaller percentage of the student body than "Latino/bilingual" students, this extreme monetary discrepancy

only served to reinforce the point of many that Black students were undervalued and underserved at South Central.

Whose knowledge is of most worth?

And numbers in terms of unequal compensation for adults were also an issue, just as they were in 1996. Many people expressed feelings ranging from discomfort and disappointment to anger and resentment that the knowledge, skills and efforts put forth by "African-American/EO" staff members were not perceived as valued--financially or professionally. That teachers in Model A and Model B classrooms still received hefty bilingual stipends was a huge point of contention. Not only were their Spanish skills overvalued, people argued (they should be immersing children in English, they reminded me), but the ESL skills of many EO teachers were undervalued in this English-focused environment. One custodial and security staff member echoed many others when he told me, "People are still wondering why bilingual teachers are getting stipends if 227 has passed and we all only teach in English. If we are all teaching English we should all get the same." And Elizabeth explained,

> Now that we have 227 you would think that there would be an emphasis on people with skills to teach a second language and ESL... But no, that stipend is hardly anything now [Language Development Specialist, LDS, certificate]. ... They took our [LDS] stipend. It used to be $2500, now I think it's $750. But the bilingual stipend is still in place [$5000]. Kim, you have your [Model A/B] class because you are bilingual. I have my class, all transition [bilingual program students with strong enough English to now receive most instruction in English, ready to redesignate], because I have an LDS but I am not compensated for it. I mean *not that you would do anything different in the one class from the other basically, but the one stipend is still in place and the other is not*. … When 227 came you had bilingual teachers who said, 'I don't know how to teach English. I don't know how to teach reading in English.' As if it was a foreign thing!

I told her I had also heard this from teachers. We wondered out loud together whether they had ever taught anything in English in their *bi*lingual classes. Hearing this admission from bilingual teachers was all the more frustrating to EO teachers when their

expertise was not tapped. Said Janice, "None of the bilingual teachers have come to me asking for help even though they know I have been teaching *English* Language Arts for 20 years. I have a million supplies and now they need us because we have the expertise but they're not coming to ask."

When it came time to "do the matrix" (to choose which classes we would teach the following school year) this mismatch of value to skills seemed to rise to the surface again--just like in 1996. In April of 1999 I wrote in my field notes,

> We did the matrix today. There were all kinds of crazy class makeups, many classes a mixture of Model A, Model B, bilingual and EO! So the qualifications were confusing--did you need a BCLAD? LDS?... [One teacher] did not know which classes she was qualified to teach and she kept asking questions. It ended up that she couldn't get what she wanted because she did not have a BCLAD. [A few "African-American/EO" teachers] sat behind me and kept making comments quietly about how experience should count in class selection, not language ability.

Two teachers shared the following experiences of having their knowledge, skills, and efforts ignored, taken advantage of, or undervalued. Said Mary,

> I'm not against bilingual education by any stretch of the imagination and I disagree with 227 but I think there are times when we need it. ... The reason that bilingual education failed, you know, quote on quote failed, and I don't think it failed completely, but broke down, is because we did not have the proper teachers teaching ESL. The people who were teaching ESL were teaching with a Spanish, or Armenian, or Korean accent. In linguistics, we know that all the inflections that go along with phonemic awareness of the language are lost because they don't know it themselves. And I went into a lot of classes in our school where the people who were teaching learned English as a second language themselves, and they had things that were on the board wrong, dramatically, spelling and everything else.... I am an English major and a Sociology major, a double major, and I minored in education. So I know English. I speak it properly, but am I valued? No.... I don't want to see this bilingual program pull everybody apart again. You know, it could! Some people are very angry....

And Elizabeth shared,

> I took Spanish in high school and college. I never really held onto it, though, and then I started working here. They needed bilingual teachers and I wasn't but they gave me a bilingual and multi-grade classroom. So you pick it up. Then I was teamed up with a person who was bilingual and we started planning together and it got to the point where I wanted a bilingual class. By then I had taken two more years of Spanish at the college. I wanted to be in the bilingual classrooms so I could use what I learned and become proficient at it. And then I was denied because someone else was Level A [desired fluency level to teach in a bilingual classroom].... I was *denied*. And since then I haven't taken one more class of Spanish.... You know when they needed me it was okay but then when I wanted it and they didn't need me, too bad.... Obviously it was for the betterment of the kids. He was good at both languages so he got the job and I was put in an English class and I've been there ever since. That used to anger us. Your skills that once were valuable, now they didn't have any value.

Reflecting on the value of the experience and expertise of EO teachers as it could have been with 227, the principal told me:

> I think if 227 had passed the way a lot of people thought, we would be teaching everything in English and instead of separate classes you'd have everybody together. It would be integrated. If that had happened we'd be like one school. [But because it didn't] we still have the matrix and everything, and I don't know, there's probably a certain amount of prestige in being bilingual, you get paid more and you get first choice in the matrix, and so there should be prestige attached to um the teachers that can work with the predominant EO classroom and manage those students and make them learn and deal with discipline and all that and that is harder. And there are teachers who can do it wonderfully. And I think if the school had gone with 227 the way people thought, then they probably would be recognized. ... And I think people don't want to talk about that. You know you say something like that and you're in danger of being branded a racist. But it's true.

So we see concrete examples of knowledge, skills and experience that were seen as undervalued or ignored simply because people did not speak Spanish (well enough): experience teaching in English, college coursework in Spanish, college degrees in English, recognized success teaching African-American students.

… and connecting to national level discourses and trends: “They got what they wanted.”

On a few occasions when describing these dynamics to me, people echoed particular discourses from the national media: Immigration, Latinos and the Spanish language were constructed as creating division and inequity in the government, in social services, and in American culture. America was constructed as an English-speaking, assimilationist melting pot. People employed discourses about a Latino invasion changing the face of America. They echoed discourses about the Spanish language and Latino culture(s) tilting the landscape of social services and resources away from "Americans" and towards immigrants. They echoed regional media discourses about Los Angeles becoming "Latino-ized," causing racial strife and inequality that had to be addressed for the civic institution of public education to fulfill its charge of educating all well.

Sitting with me on the playground benches one day after school, a parent told me about how his daughter, who had recently come to live with him just a block away from the campus, had to enroll at a neighboring school instead of South Central because of over-enrollment. This change of school caused his family transportation and schedule difficulties, he told me, and it was due in large part to the continuing explosion of Latino immigration to the area. "Mexicans are taking over," he said and...

> The United States is not dealing with the issues. They are throwing it up under the table. .... They don't see it because all our assemblyman our Latin. All of them and it is a Latin machine that is winning, that is pushing forward regardless of what anybody else says. So the Lieutenant Governor, he's going to be working with all of the state assemblyman who are Latin, or we say Spanish-speaking Americans, to decide upon [things] because they're in larger numbers.

Another parent was also reported to have directly linked her child not receiving necessary services to the presence of "Mexicans in America." The principal told a group of us teachers in the cafeteria one day that he had just left an irate parent in the office, "who was mad about her child not getting some services that she wanted. She said to me, 'Why

do these Mexicans have to be here anyway? This is America.' I said that it wasn't that, it was just that the service wasn't available. But she was still mad..."

Mary explained this way:

> Kim, if you are a bilingual teacher you don't understand the position that we're going through because we are being discriminated against. Look, I had to do things in English and Spanish in my modified [bilingual] class [before 227]. I had a modified class a few years and my work was doubled, too, like yours. Yet I was discriminated against in my own country because I didn't speak the language [Spanish]. And even though those kids are doing well now in fourth and fifth grade, I didn't get the accolades like, 'You're doing such a good job.' It's a very bitter pill. ... And I get really irked when during an assembly I see teachers talking to each other during the Pledge of Allegiance. We are teaching the kids to respect this country because this country is giving them a free education. And then you have these teachers and some other people who walk around with, they don't care, they got their free education and some of them refused to become citizens and they are living off this country. Go back to your own country, then, live off their money!... A lot of people who emigrated from Europe were literate, but a lot of people who came here from Europe were not literate and they still managed to fall into the fold of the country. The problem is, the influx of Mexicans. There are so many of them coming here.

Interestingly, several people summarized these post-227 politics in terms almost identical to some of their "Latino/bilingual" counterparts: This teacher sounded like others when she charged, "All in all, the bilinguals, they can't complain anymore . We have all been forced to go all English, none of us have a choice, and they're still favored so they still get what they want."

A different look at things: the conflict is over, or subsiding

And yet, also like their "Latino/bilingual" counterparts, a few "African-American/EO" school community members provided a different version of school community dynamics post-227. These people portrayed the warring factions of the mid-1990s as having reached a truce. Fewer than amongst "Latinos/bilinguals," however--only three people on this side told me at one point or another that they thought the conflict over bilingual education had subsided. Of these people, two were white and one

was African-American. And amongst these three, two argued at *other* points in time that the war actually still raged. The one teacher who argued that the situation and the solution were simple was white. He explained,

> I think the school going English can't help but bring us together. We're all getting English materials, even just that. We have a common goal of getting all kids to read. We had that as a common goal before, but just not having a language barrier, like, "I'm EO, you're Spanish," it softens the line between the groups.

The other two teachers constructed the situation more complexly: Elizabeth shared that although there was definitely still discord (recall her quote earlier about racial tensions being "on fire"),

> I think that 227 really stopped some of the divisiveness because now we are all together. ... [And] it's made my job easier. Before it was the African-American kids here [gestures to the left] and the Hispanic kids here [gestures to the right], but now with so much redesignation they're all mixed together by the time they get to the upper grades and it's just everybody.... As someone who has worked on redesignation [during her off-track time she worked with groups of students to prepare them for the redesignation test] for the last three years, I have seen a big improvement in the writing that the kids come with. Before 227 when I would work with them I would have to work on the basic sight words--what, where, when, etc. But now we don't have to work on those kinds of things. We are working on adjectives, adverbs, past tense. And their oral skills are so much better. .... I have even had teachers come to me and show me a *second* grader's writing and they say, 'Do you think they are ready?' And I say 'Oh my goodness yes.' Now we see that the focus should be on redesignating kids in the primary grades. They are ready to go."

And in the same interview that Michael argued that things were "still the same," i.e. that the "war" still raged on, he reflected that, "Racial politics here have quieted down because we are so busy with all these changes that we're too busy to fight! If I had known the chaos 227 would cause at this school, I would not have voted for it." He also pointed out to me that with so many new teachers (turnover is high at South Central Elementary) there were fewer and fewer people around who even remembered the debates of 1996.

I believe that these constructions of the conflict as over/subsiding were both tentative and fewer in number than on the "Latino/bilingual" side because there were still so many ways in which "African-American/EO" school community members experienced marginalization, disrespect and denial of access to resources and decision making power. And I believe the fact that two of the three people who portrayed the conflict as "over" were white may follow the pattern seen amongst "Latino/bilingual" school community members--whiteness allowing a kind of passive refusal to recognize enduring patterns of inequity beneath any any surface harmony, and an excused absence from a responsibility to address the patterns (I will explore this further in the whiteness section).

Agendas for the future within local and national contexts

English Only

Just as in 1996 and just like many of their "Latino/bilingual" counterparts, in the post-227 years many "African-American/EO" school community members presented fractured agendas for the future. There were some who continued to argue for universal monolingual English instruction, substantiating their position with discourses common in media debates about bilingual education. They talked about creating a level playing field, and fairness and equity as the mission of public education. They placed this agenda within the context of an America where English was *the* valued competence. Yet this argument was now more complex than the pro-English Only argument in the pre-227 days. As much as people continued to argue that English was the linguistic capital that schools should be imparting to children in America, this stance seemed to soften. Now they also granted that fairness and equity could be upheld if there was concomitant *limited bilingual instruction, as long as it was not placed in competition with English Only--as long as Spanish/Latinos/bilinguals didn't take away from the resources and value of English/African-Americans.* (This connects to media reports about Midwestern states launching campaigns to bring immigrants to the state while passing laws that made

English the official language.) For example, Enrique told me about one "African-American/EO" staff member who told him that bilingual education wouldn't be so bad if it didn't rob Black children dollar-for-dollar of a good education. He told me that she explained her pro-227 vote this way:

> I know the bilingual program was successful. For that reason I voted for 227, because I don't think it was fair that a successful program was being used on Latinos but no program was being used on African-Americans. If African-Americans are going to get a crappy education, everyone is going to get a crappy education.

Put another way, a staff member explained to me, "I'm not against bilingual education so long as it doesn't take away from EO's. The Spanish people, they don't really do anything to support our people and yet they ask us to support them. I think we're in America and we should speak English. People should teach in English." And one teacher shared,

> I've never really been against bilingual education but I haven't really been for it either. I feel like this is an English-speaking country and everybody needs to speak English. I know you need bilingual education to help the kids tran… what is the word I am looking for... tran… [I ask, "Transition?"] Transition. Yes. But still. ... I talked to some parents the other day at the parent appreciation day and they said that they feel like their children aren't getting a good education, they don't get as much attention as the Hispanic kids. And I talked to another teacher, and I voiced the same opinion and this teacher said, 'Well what are we supposed to do? If the Black parents don't like it they should move out.' I was so shocked. So I said, 'That's a terrible thing to say. This community happens to be Hispanic and Black and we have to make everybody happy. They all deserve an equal education.'

The continued call for universal bilingualism

The other component of the fractured agenda could still be heard post-227, just as it was in the mid-1990s: The call for universal dual language bilingual education. These arguments were also articulated to discourses about fairness, equity and a level playing field, only they were placed within the context of America and/or Los Angeles as

multilingual, diverse, and global. When I asked one campus aide a question about the current state of the 1996 war he responded,

> It's not going on as much as before, but it's still here.... There are still times that people are fixin' to go to blows. I don't see why the Black kids can't learn Spanish. Every time you go for a job in this area, in this city, the first thing they ask you after your name is, 'Are you bilingual? Do you speak Spanish?' So the Black kids who don't learn Spanish lose out. Why can't we just teach everybody both? The Ed Aides here, there are two or three who still want this to happen. We still want it.... The kids have to learn Spanish to go places and do things.

Eleanor confirmed this, telling me that she still believed that all children should be able to become bilingual. However, removing this proposition from our campus context she said, "Let's face it. Hispanics are here, they're going to be here. Their language is going to be a part, so why not? Why not make it a requirement for everyone that when you go to the sixth, seventh grade, everyone learn Spanish?"

And a parent connected universal bilingualism to communal respect, caring and opportunity when he stated,

> I think it's wonderful, really, to learn it at a younger age. There is no hatred among babies. You have to remember the Golden Rule: Treat others how you would want to be treated. Yes, bilingual and English, it is a learning tool on both aspects of the pendulum. It is great to be bilingual and to understand what is being said. [Then] we won't feel inferior or insecure.... I agree that Spanish should be shared among non-Spanish-speaking students and that if it's spoken in the house the parents should try to speak English. It's a two-fold situation.

Here we see an interesting shift in the relationship between micro and macro, local and national discourses. In the mid-1990s "African-American/EO" school community members who argued for dual language bilingual education directly challenged the hegemonic media construction of a monolingual English America (that they drew upon to argue against bilingual instruction as the vehicle for the growing power and monopoly on cultural citizenship that Latinos seemed to have). While they argued that America was an English-speaking nation and that Latinos should assimilate

linguistically, when they argued for bilingual education for African-Americans, too, they reluctantly embraced the increasingly multilingual national ethnoscape as experienced in the local--Los Angeles. They drew legitimacy for their pro-bilingual positions from a local context that was in direct contrast to the prevailing popular ideal of a monolingual nation.

Post-227, however, much in the popular national consciousness and media discourses about "America" had changed. By 1998 "African-American/EO" school community members could still draw on the deep reservoir of anti-bilingual education media discourses that painted the U.S. as a traditionally and ideally monolingual English-speaking, melting pot nation. This lent legitimacy to their continuing English Only agenda and invested in the cultural capital identified with the EO program--English. However, this construction of the socio-linguistic parameters of the American community sat in competition with the *now hegemonic, ubiquitous* media reports and popular debates about "the American nation with an identity crisis"--shifting demographics, changing linguistic norms and complex cultural dynamics. This America sat at the nexus of a global, multilingual world, where effects were felt in communities small and large. The valued competencies in *this* America were bilingualism and cultural fluidity.

As we saw, within this new moment of hegemony even continuing EO advocates now ceded a wary acceptance of the importance of bilingualism, and hence of bilingual education alongside EO--as long as it did not begin slicing into the piece of the pie that was the rightful resources of "African-Americans/EO's." And continuing proponents of universal bilingual education could now connect directly to widely-accepted constructions of the American nation as global nation. Like Marcus (1998), Shore and Wright (1997) and others, Woolard and Schiefflelin (1994) asks the following question about the co-constructed nature of political discourses in local and national contexts: How does the "constant acting in view of the system" done at local sites "alter the system itself" (16); and to what effects? It seemed that, in an important way, the national consciousness and discourses had finally caught up with South Central Elementary: Now, although the English Only and dual language agendas espoused by "African-

Americans/EO" school community members still conflicted with each other and still articulated to conflicting constructions of nation, the call for dual language instruction was no longer an odd local case nor a bellwether of coming trends. The trends were here, and reported on and talked about in more and more local communities nationwide. *In reaction to this as much as shaping this*, powerful players like Ron Unz were making last attempts to head the changes off at the pass. But even massive policy shifts like Proposition 227 could not contain all those things that, in local and popular media parlance of the time, made "America" feel like "Amexica."

Reflections on policy: the power of ch(v)oice in cultural citizenship

Here again we see what I believe to be a crux of the conflict at South Central Elementary: Choice and voice in policy processes as a key component of people's sense of cultural citizenship. As “African-American/EO” school community members negotiated community dynamics post-227, the same urgent question arose: Who are we, anymore-- who has full cultural citizenship on our campus--and what does this say about us? Regardless of whether individuals felt that 227 was a positive or negative policy step, whether they argued for EO or dual language bilingual instruction, so many echoed this teacher when she broke it down like this: "It's a very bitter pill. We ask for things, we don't get them. Nobody listens. We do the same job, we don't get paid the same. Our students struggle, nobody cares. *See, Kim, I'm not against bilingual education, I'm against the way the system is handling it, and us, and them*." Indeed, now that English Immersion was official policy and the bilingual program was (at least ostensibly, barring perceived cheating) fighting for its life, it seemed to become clear that the particular language policy in place was not the issue.

So again, as Urciuoli (1996) might say, it was not bilingual education itself that held the meaning, but the context and relations within which it was used--its pragmatics--that gave it meaning. As many had argued from the mid-1990s—it was differential access to cultural citizenship across a range of dynamics--personal, professional, academic,

monetary, linguistic, etc.--that still needed to become equitable between African-Americans and Latinos. Post-227, questions about educational language policy seemed to crystallize for more people as less a single topic of contention and more as a complex constellation of sites across which groups with distinct and overlapping political, economic, and cultural visions attempted to define what the socially legitimate means and ends of the school community and society were to be (Apple 1993).

"African-American/EO," me

I had a fractured experience of cultural citizenship dynamics at our school and I espoused a fractured agenda: Being a bilingual educator and a strong advocate of biliteracy I understand the "Latino/bilingual" camp at South Central Elementary to have lost ground in the struggle for cultural citizenship in the regional and national context post-227. Campaigns for English Only initiatives could be seen as a direct attack on efforts to make bilingualism a valued form of cultural capital in America. And as Ramirez (2000) found in a study of 227 implementation across the state, the blanket focus on English lead to a decrease in consideration for issues of multiculturalism, instructional differentiation for student needs, and constructivist approaches in general. As such I identified strongly with many on the "Latino/bilingual" side who argued that more vigilance and effort was needed to attain an excellent education and full cultural citizenship for "Latino/bilingual" students and communities, and to push for the goal of celebrated linguistic and cultural diversity.

Yet I also whole-heartedly agreed with "African-American/EO" school community members who argued that Prop 227 did not fulfill a hope that people had for it as a Policy: that it could offer a cultural and institutional resource for leveraging space, place, voice and power in the struggle for excellence and equity for African-American children and adults. 227 could be seen to fail to elevate English Only education to a higher value or standard in our community, to deny harbor to the dream of common dual language instruction, *and* to deny a foothold for greater professional and cultural voice and value for African-Americans. As I had in 1996, I agreed that addressing this issue,

and attaining full cultural citizenship for "African-American/EO" school community members (for *all* school community members) was an imperative.

Smitherman's (2002) call for a new national public policy on language rings true for me: She called for 1) Reinforcing the need for and teaching of the language of wider communication (English, i.e. supporting the maintenance of the English Only agenda); 2) Reinforcing and reaffirming the legitimacy of non-mainstream languages and dialects and promoting their status as co-equal with English (i.e. celebrating the voices and views and values of all; utilizing Spanish and non-mainstream forms of English in instruction); and 3) Promoting the acquisition of one or more foreign languages by all students, for example Spanish due to its importance in the hemisphere and globally (i.e. dual language bilingual education) (170-174).

While people on both "sides" argued that the people on the "other side" "got what they wanted" with 227, I felt strongly that neither side got much at all. And yet, as I've stated before, the "war" did not seem to rage as forcefully as in 1996. While frustrations and struggles against the perceived campaign to keep the gates to full cultural citizenship locked against "African-Americans/EO's" continued, they were expressed less publicly, less frequently and less forcefully than before 227. Discourses about who "we" at South Central were, who we should be and why became less battle cries than points of argument.

I believe that this was in part because a certain sense of resignation settled in amongst those on the "African-American/EO side" by 1998, like amongst their "Latino/bilingual" counterparts. There no longer seemed to be the cultural, political or policy space within which to launch an all-out offensive based on a choice for monolingual or for that matter even dual language bilingual instruction. The official Policy of 227 did mandate immersing formerly bilingual program students in English, but in the lived experience of local policy implementation, many still considered Model A and Model B to "be bilingual"--Spanish was still heard on campus and in classrooms. Bilingual (waivered) classes still existed. And EO students and adults still seemed to be at a disadvantage. And at the same time, within the state policy framework of 227 and

the cultural backlash that spawned the proliferation of English immersion initiatives nationwide, the call for dual language bilingual education now seemed even less hopeful than it had been in 1996. (In the LAUSD itself, before 227 there were 10 schools with Spanish dual language programs. By 2002 there were only six (Blume 2002). "The whole swing of things has changed," a principal at one of the schools was quoted as saying in a local newspaper. "We are focusing on getting our students to adopt the English language. There hasn't been anyone who's called up and wanted" the once coveted dual language program for their child (18).)

And so although English for the Children had brought the possibility of dissolving the conflict at South Central Elementary--it practically outlawed the (supposed) issue at hand, after all, bilingual instruction--what it actually could be seen to do in the daily life of many "African-American/EO" school community members was extinguish further their sense of choice and voice in the struggle to bring equitable and excellent education to Black students, to all students. 227 was here to stay, and to recall an earlier quote, many felt that, "All in all, the bilinguals, they can't complain anymore . We have all been forced to go all English, none of us have a choice, and they're still favored so they still get what they want."

Where and how could common ground, a coalitional approach to equitable, communally defined and strived for cultural citizenship be found? As vocal bilingual education advocate Kenji Hakuta advised the United States Commission on Civil Rights in 2001, states and school communities "need to think more broadly" about programs and instruction. "What is critical," he argued, "is finding and communicating a set of program components that work for the children in a given community of interest, within the context of the goals, demographics, and resources of the community" (Hakuta 2001: 10). For us at South Central Elementary, this encouraged me to reach for that place where we could see that, as Gómez Peña (1987: 47) reminds us, sometimes "*La frontera es lo único que compartimos*." ("The border is the only thing we share."--my translation). How could we make the *frontera* between "African-American/EO" and

“Latino/bilingual” a place where boundaries are understood not as the end of things, not as a wall, but as where *things begin their presencing* (Bhabba 1994:1), as a window?

I knew that for us to address these questions we would have to consider *all* of the encompassing dynamics of our school community politics. And at least one key dynamic still seemed to go largely unaddressed as people discussed who "we" we were and where we needed to go: white folks and the role of whiteness in this "African-American/EO"-"Latino/bilingual" conflict. It is to these dynamics that I now turn.

White/ness

Just like in 1996 I had to look past the surface descriptions that people gave of post-227 politics in order to get a feel for the pragmatics of whiteness on campus. Similar to dynamics in 1996, although in 1998-2000 white people comprised 21% of the adults on campus (including myself and several who held key positions of power--principal, vice principal, Bilingual Coordinator as of 1999), we were strangely unacknowledged as an interpretive community.

When I asked Latino and African-American school community members how white people fit into politics on campus they usually responded in ways similar to 1996--with either one extreme of, "They don't. They're withdrawn," or the other extreme of, "They can see both sides. They try to help everybody." For example, one TA answered, "You [looking at me] can see both sides. You don't choose anybody over anybody. I mean even within Latinos, some of us can't even get along with some of us. That's depressing."

When I asked white people themselves where whites fit into the stories they told me, most said quite flatly some version of, "I don't know," or they engaged the same kind of avoidance discourses they did in 1996--those of neutrality, denial of race issues, and claims to removed rationality and naiveté. For example, just after Elizabeth described to me how she and other EO teachers were "on fire" about “racial” inequity at the school, she explained to me when I asked about being white in this "Black-Brown" conflict that

actually she was not part of it at all: "I don't really know, I try to stay out of things. I don't really know this underlying thing you are referring to." After telling me how active she was in statewide campaigns against Propositions 187, 209 and 227, Amy responded to my question about her whiteness ("What's it like to be white on campus, amidst all these politics?") by claiming remove in the local context and acknowledging the advantage of this: "227 and bilingualism don't really affect me. Being white is actually an advantage, the politics here don't affect me at all." Another teacher, an EO teacher, drew a line between himself as calm and rational and African-Americans as irrational (as complaining and unaware of democratic principles). He then implicitly acknowledged historical racial oppression but excused himself from complicity:

> I think that when I first got here in 1996 there was tension. Fighting. ... I mean I never felt it, I always had the materials that I needed, plus I'm just flexible, I go with the flow. I'm not one to say, 'I need this!' I don't like to cause conflict. I would hear the Ed Aides [all of whom are Black] talking, saying bad things about the administration, and I would say, 'I'm sick of this.' I don't know, but if you're a minority in the school, check the numbers, the majority usually takes priority. ... I tend to get along with everyone. I don't oppress anyone or appear to be oppressive, you know what I mean.

Claiming to be above racial divisions a third teacher told me that while there was still some lingering tension on campus, "I tend to cross over where there are probably barriers and just ignore them. ... I think it's hilarious that they chose [her] the one white bilingual teacher from New Jersey to teach Latino children to sing Negro spirituals in the Black History play." On one occasion that Linda and I discussed the disastrous parent institutes that led many Black parents to refuse to return to campus, she shrugged her shoulders and stated,

> African-Americans know how ditzy white people are when it comes to race relations, they are used to it, so what we should do is go to them and just admit we do not know how this stuff happened but that we want to work to improve it, and ask them what we could do to improve it.

And the principal said to me at one point (mixing the linguistic and the racial axes of difference fluently in one sentence), "This is all really hard to solve because we're caught between people for whom bilingualism is a religion and people who live by Black Power."

Across campus when people of whatever background mentioned individuals who were white in stories, we were almost never discussed as "white people." We were still casually described either as "bilingual" or "EO," depending on which program(s) (bilingual/Model A/Model B or EO) we were associated with. Either way, we were still not called to the table as invested, complicit racialized participants in--and benefactors of--racially differentiated access to full cultural citizenship in local or national contexts. Portrayed as outside, unaware of and/or above the racial aspects of the conflict, we again got excused from the challenge of addressing complex, enduring, sometimes painful issues of race and inequity, and from the responsibility to contribute to struggles for universal excellence.

This exclusion of white from the "Black-Brown" conflict was not complete, however. While the whiteness of *individuals* may have hardly ever surfaced as salient, in Latino and African-Americans' discursive constructions of post-227 school politics *national dynamics of white privilege* did. Whiteness seemed to continue to operate “in and between” subject positions (MacCannell 1992: 131), alternately performed, constructed, inhabited, assigned and employed “by actors in a range of subject positions" (Ellsworth 1997: 267). On two occasions African-American school community members equated the positionality of Latinos with that of whites in national structures of power and privilege.

One parent explained his frustration with the school this way: Latinos have assumed/been given the power that whiteness confers--the power to control access to resources [e.g. information in the school office], value in the community and even existence. He said,

> Somewhere along the line the federal government must have told these people they are white or something. It's a problem. One of the clerks downstairs, she's Spanish, or Spanish or Mexican or whatever, uh she thought she was the *Chingadera*-- I'm trying to use a nice word instead of a profane word, it means *all that*, you know what I mean? But she wanted to be so important to where she did not know that I was intelligent enough to make a phone call.... A Latino could walk into the office, my God, there'd be three or four people over they're helping that person. I walk in the office and I have to take a number. ... We are no longer a minority. We are extinct [he pauses, struggles with tears].

And yet, he followed this stinging critique of local Black-Brown dynamics by drawing upon the national structural, institutional white/of color context. He continued, "... But if we united we could take over. Our fight isn't with each other as individuals or cultures. It's with the government, Uncle Sam, the big machine. America? I'm not part of America. America what?"

In a similar vein, one day as we discussed all the changes we were experiencing under 227, Michael reflected on the fact that "Latino/bilingual" school community members might not hold the keys to cultural citizenship on the national scene as some on the "African-American/EO" side--including himself--sometimes argued:

> I think this all goes back to Proposition 187. I mean basically that said, 'We don't give a fuck about you Mexicans. Don't go to our doctors, don't go to our schools, don't do this, don't do that. But American people voted for it and so it was implemented.... Now we're going to pass a law that says you can only be taught in English.' Now personally I really feel that they should only be taught in English, because that's the language here. That's what you have to have to survive here. ... Because I know too many kids that graduated from high school and they can't speak English. So now they're going to a job interview, but oh, they can't speak English so they just get fucked... I used to have prejudice, I talked about Mexicans. I'm not going to lie now. ... I voted for 227. But at the time I voted for it I was thinking of it as a positive aspect, like... this is the official language of this country... so we're going to teach English and this is how we are going to do it, step one, step two, step three. You know, in a way that would have benefited everybody.... But if I had known this is what it was going to do, I mean I just watched two kids from my class leave today, that I was very attached to.... It hasn't been implemented right. Schools have lost lots of money because you have to buy new books. And the Spanish books that we just bought, nobody wants them back.... So now 'we can spend more money on our precious white children'

> [says sarcastically]. You know? No offense [he says to me, laughing. "None taken," I respond.].... What really pisses me off is you [looking at me], your ancestors come over and take over the country looking for religious freedom. Then you start slavery, you take away other people's freedom. And then now you tell other people, the Mexicans, 'You can't come over here and find the same freedom that I can.'

He then made a connection between the relationships that Latinos and African-Americans have with 227, continuing with:

> I thought that 227 was a plot against Latinos but now I think it was a divide and conquer kind of thing. It keeps Black and Brown fighting amongst themselves. It hasn't run anybody out of the country and the people that voted for it don't even go to public school and could probably care less about what's going on in an individual classroom. Let's take you at random, Kim. They could care less what's going on in your classroom, whether the kids are getting taught in English or not. Just because everybody's so gung-ho about red, white, and blue and we want English and we want American everything, you know. It's like, it's like a breakdown of the races. It's like a breakdown of the languages. ... We can't even be Americans. Were African-American, Mexican-American. It's so divided. ... I think 227 was from the get-go a weapon. It's hurting everybody except the people who voted for it.... How many people do you wonder voted yes for 227 that have their children in an all-white school? It was like that when it was only white people in the government but it's not only white people in the government now. It's all races in the government and the same shit is still happening.

Here we see Michael at once recalling his identification with the pro-227, anti-bilingual education/anti-Latino discourses of English in America and his vote for the measure, while also disassociating himself from his vote and those discourses due to their connection to the privileged, oppressive positionality of white people.

This recalls the work of Gilroy (1987) on the makeup and function of "interpretive communities" in struggles for material and social advantage: Members share similar points of location within and against hegemonic ideological and material formations. Membership in interpretive communities is fluid, constantly (re)articulated according to relations to different systems of power and the attendant shared use of a “multi-accented symbolic repertoire” (235). Or as Bourdieu (1991) proposed, groups of

people form and reform as they see themselves occupying similar positions in the social space, and hence as possessing similar kinds and similar quantities of capital, life chances, dispositions, etc.. Hall (1988) also reminds us that social collectivities in struggles often have more than one set of agendas: They "have both the interest of advancing and improving their position" within a certain arena, "and of not losing their place" within another (45). As such, actors often assume "a number of specific subject positions" in relation to the issues at hand (49). On the one hand African-Americans were constructed as an interpretive community aligned around symbolic discourses about English as quintessentially "American," and "Mexicans" portrayed as outsiders/immigrants in conflict with that "America." On the other hand African-Americans and Latinos were portrayed as a single interpretive community, allied within and against an "America" constructed as a bastion of white privilege.

Michael then goes further, pointing out that while privilege and the ability to oppress have historically and traditionally been the purview of whiteness, today's more diverse governing bodies still enact, support, and maintain policies that disenfranchise people of color--that sustain the "white only" barriers to full cultural citizenship. Returning to Gilroy's important point (1987) that interpretive communities can articulate their positionality and agendas to multiple symbols of power and possibilities, we see Michael pointing out that hegemonic ideology “is not the exclusive property” of that perceived as “the hegemonic.” It’s “underlying assumptions” are often “duplicate[d] in precise detail” by those in non-dominant or even explicitly “counterhegemonic” positions (64,40). Whiteness understood as sets of practices, forms of property, performances, or shifting locations of privilege/subordination (Ellsworth 1997: 264) can act *through* multiple positionalities, white, Brown or Black; at once buttressing historical structures of inclusion/exclusion and allowing the space for coalitional Black-Brown attacks on these structures—“It’s all races in the government and the same shit is still happening.”

This is also notably one of the only two times (and they are both quoted here) that the whiteness of an individual was highlighted as salient in the dynamics that school community members negotiated--*and that individual was me*! I hoped that is indicated

and was engendered by a closeness, an identification, a level of trust that my fellow school community members and I built over the years and in our time together in 1998-2000. I think it indicates that people were ready to talk about and engage with whiteness in the "Black-Brown" conflict if they were given the spark of a question about it. Individuals across color and language lines might have approached acknowledging the personal roles that we all play in dynamics of hegemony and resistance and in struggles for inclusion and equity, if there was an openness to it and a trusting, safe relationship between those doing it. I also feel that these identifications of *my* whiteness compared to (what I found to be) the lack of acknowledgment of others' highlights a cultural citizenship issue for white school community members. While white people generally enjoy a full and valued membership, voice and agency in national socio-political spheres and in institutional structures, did we really tap into full belonging at South Central? Did we understand how *all* of our identities and life trajectories are constantly intertwined, co-dependent? As the nation, our profession, and this community move towards ever-more diverse demographic and social makeups, were we able to build the perspectives, reflectiveness, and skills necessary to continue to be successful and to plant the seeds of success for our children in this future--to be productive participants? At least speaking for myself, I do not think so. I take this up in the Activist Anthropology chapter.

Looking beyond dichotomies: Border crossing, finding common ground

As discussed, just like in 1996 there were school community members in the post-227 context who crossed the discursively constructed borders between the two "sides." There were African-American teachers who had taught in the bilingual program and who then taught Model A or Model B, for example. There were Latino teachers who did not fully support bilingual education. And as we just saw, there were staff members considered "African-American/EO" who were white, and staff members considered "Latino/bilingual" who were white--me being one of them.

In 1998-2000 I also found more complex border crossing dynamics. Reflecting on life with English for the Children, a few people actually changed their minds about what kind of educational agenda they supported, identifying at different times with the perspectives and agenda attributed to "the other side." There was Linda, as mentioned earlier, who had long been a bilingual education advocate but who was so pleased with how much English her children were learning in her class that she decided that teachers who continued to encourage waivers back to bilingual instruction were doing a "disservice" to the students. And there was the bilingual teacher-turned Title I Coordinator who said (also mentioned earlier), "…We hated 227 but I think slowly we have come to see that teaching in English to these children really, it's kind of a good thing. It really is what's best." And there was Michael who explained to me why he turned from pro-227 to anti-227--he came to see it as less a sound educational policy mandating English instruction and more as "a plot against Latinos," a "divide and conquer" tactic.

Further cross-pollenization of perspectives occurred post-227: A few people spoke critically to me about *both* sides and identified common ground between the two. Though few, there were moments when people drew connections for me between the educational trajectories and cultural citizenship struggles of African-Americans, EO's, Latinos, and bilinguals on our campus and in the national socio-political context, articulating a political perspective similar to mine (discussed earlier). Two examples were quoted in the previous section--the parent referring to Latinos' and African-Americans' common struggle against "Uncle Sam" and Michael's discussion of 227 policy as a "divide and conquer" mechanism of the white-identified power structure. The Bilingual Coordinator in 1999 connected the longitudinal educational plight of many bilingual program students to that of EO students, explaining that although he was very pro-bilingual education,

> I was shocked that there were [kids] who weren't being served effectively by the program... I did work at the cluster [the midway administrative level within the District at the time], in the Instructional Cabinet there. It opened my eyes to learn

> that there were eighth graders dropping out because they couldn't access the curriculum in English, and these kids had been in our system since kindergarten! Yes, over 50% of the kids in the bilingual program, by eighth grade, were dropping out because they didn't have the skills to access the curriculum. It was always the first thing on our agenda at the cluster meetings: 'LEP issues.' I think it was there for compliance, so we could show that we were addressing it... But no one was ever like, 'Oh my God let's do something.'... It's just like with the EO kids. We have to do something about it but since I've been here we still haven't. We are failing kids from *both* groups.

Linda even shared with me on one occasion her emerging opinion that all kids were underserved at South Central, not just "Latino/bilingual" students. Talking to me about the difficulty of finding consensus on the LEARN Council, she expressed her frustration that divisions between racial groups kept them from making important program decisions. Giving an example of such a decision she said, "I mean we have not even yet *tried* the recommendations of the Program Quality Review report, which lists several things that the school could do to improve African-American students and school-community relations. And Lord knows we need to."

I believe that people began to make these connections (which I did not hear hardly any of in 1996) due at least in part to the simple fact that more staff members began to work across programs. The number of classrooms that mixed EO with Model A, Model B and/or bilingual (yes, sometimes all in one classroom!) went from 9 in 1999-2000 to 19 in 2000-2001. Also, the fact that we were all affected by the first chaotic year of 227 with multiple classroom reorganizations, materials redistributions, etc. may have led people to see more commonality across earlier lines of division. And, as I have argued in earlier sections, I think that people on both sides of the "Latino/bilingual"-"African-American/EO" line began to feel a certain amount of resignation of agency under Proposition 227. Recall the sentiments of people on both sides who argued that the *other* side "got what they wanted" with 227, that things were *still* not where they should be, but that there was not much room for change agendas because the policy was "here to stay."

This sense that now neither side had room to advance their agenda may have allowed some people the space to see the sides a little less as opposing across a line of

EO/bilingual and a little more as jointly disserved by the dictates of English Immersion, the District and national socio- political trends; a little less as opposing across lines of Black/Brown and a little more as jointly advocating for language minorities and people of color subject to systematic attack and underserved by the public educational institution. Looking at the achievement data for South Central Elementary it would be hard not to see this: In 1998-1999 and 1999-2000 our school scored at the bottom of the state's Academic Performance Index scale--even our higher-performing students were scoring and the low end of the scale. One side having an advantage over the other becomes hard to argue when both sides are so far behind where we should expect them to be.

It was these dynamics that I tried to address as an individual teacher and school community member through my daily participation, my daily work from 1998-2000. But life in schools is not an individual endeavor. These were the dynamics that I most hoped to face together--to confront, to analyze, and to act upon in concert with others, through the Activist component of my project. In the next chapter I discuss these efforts in detail and draw some general conclusions about anthropology in schools today.

CHAPTER 6 TEACHER, ANTHROPOLOGIST, ACTIVIST

"Ms. Anderson," Room 112: Activist Anthropology Goals and Plan

As discussed in the introductory chapter, the general impetus for my research comes from the basic critique and ideals of the multicultural education movement, drawing particularly on work in what Sleeter and Grant call "multicultural social reconstructionist education" (1994, Sleeter 1996). This scholarship pushes the analysis of race, class, gender and other socio-political dynamics in order to expose how cultural production is organized within unequal relations of power in schools, so as to enliven struggles for social justice in and through education (for example Delgado-Gaitan and Trueba 1991, McCarthy and Crichlow 1993, hooks 1994b, Delpit 1993, 1995, Delpit and Kilgour Dowdy 2002, Apple 1996, Fine et al. 1997, Darder, Torres and Gutierrez 1997, Ladson-Billings 1994, 1998). Two forces then inspired me to undertake this work via an activist stance--to make my anthropology "homework" as much as it was "fieldwork" (Gordon 1997:viii, citing Visweswaran 1994).

One driving force was my love for teaching and for kids. I missed the classroom something fierce when I wasn't there. I believed (believe) that public education can be a powerful unifying force in society if people dedicated to equity, social justice and universal cultural citizenship keep their sleeves rolled up and their noses to the grindstone--and I wanted to be one of them. The second driving force was that I contracted a case of what I call Ivory Tower Syndrome. In graduate school I came to identify with the feminist, postmodernist, post-colonial and native/insider ethnography critiques of the removed, dispassionate anthropologist collecting data and writing from an unreflective position of power. I became weary of hearing other social scientists tell me all about what they were "interested in" and nothing about what they were "dedicated to" in regards to their object of study. I wanted to do more than just take data from South Central Elementary to satisfy an "interest"; I wanted to give my work to the campus

community and children that I loved and that had given so much to me, in order that my work and my research could contribute to struggles to make a difference for kids.

I approached my first research period in 1996 as an opportunity to re-establish ties with the school community and to explore the "war" that had erupted out of politics that had begun to brew while I was a teacher there. It required me to not only learn new things about South Central Elementary but to re-examine things about my experiences and positionality as a *bilingual* teacher, as a *white* teacher, as an advocate for *all* kids at our school, and now as a researcher. I think any limited "activism" at that point took the form of writing and speaking about my work from a teacher and community insider perspective in my thesis, at academic conferences, and at forums for educators and school community members (for example at the California Association for Bilingual Education conference in 2001 my paper and question-and-answer session was actively participated in by parents, educators and scholars alike). The 1996 work also formed the basis for my longitudinal look at the politics of cultural citizenship, the place from which I picked up in 1998. It prepared me to undertake a more "active" activist stance.

Two basic ideas guided my plans for activist research in 1998-2000. The first was Atweh, Kemmis and Wilkinson's (1998) idea of Participatory Action Research (PAR). Similar to Freire's idea of conscientização (1973) and drawing on Fals Borda (1979), Atweh, Kemmis and Wilkinson state that participatory action researchers do research "on themselves" (1998: 23), investigating reality in order to change it and changing reality in order to investigate it (21). Participants explore and critique their knowledge, interpretive categories, communication and experiences. They strive to understand the ways in which these are shaped by social structures, discourses and power in and across the dimensions of subjective/individual/local/micro and objective/social/macro (23, 25). PAR is undertaken with the faith that when these connections are understood dynamically people are poised to improve their realities (32-33).

As outlined in the introductory chapter, I planned/hoped to establish a forum at South Central Elementary where teachers and eventually all school community members

could address questions about conflict over bilingual education and Prop 227, other politics on campus, teacher practice, and about how all of these shaped our relationships and roles as political subjects in a wider sense. I hoped we could use this forum as a springboard for educational and political projects that would counter hegemonic assumptions about what language(s) are appropriate for whom and why; that would challenge hegemonic relations of inequality based on difference of language, race, nation or otherwise (Haraway 1988); and that would pry open the doors to full cultural citizenship for all of us.

Another goal for my plans for PAR was, quite simply, the P: Participation. I knew that being "Ms. Anderson, room 112" meant that I would be accountable to the state and District, to the standards, to the school community, to my principal and colleagues, to my students' parents and most of all to the young scholars of room 112. But being a teacher would involve more than just working with students (which is one of the most challenging jobs there is, period). There were school committees to serve on, professional trainings to go to and share, and innumerable unforeseen other roles to play as required to provide the best educational program for my/our students as possible.

For example, my work in the District Intern program ended up entailing a few weeks of planning sessions and then teaching a four-hour Thursday night and occasional Saturday course for a few months at a time. I taught a few courses in Diversity In Education/Multicultural Education and Brain-Based Teaching and Learning . I stopped after, frankly, it became too much with everything else I had going on. Working as the school's Standards-Based Assessment Coordinator involved several days of training by the District and what amounted to about a week and a half's time (spread out over the year) in working with teachers on standards-based assessment concepts, the format and implementation of the assessments themselves, the scoring of the assessments, and the reporting of our scores. I held this position for both 1998-1999 and 1999-2000. Founding and coordinating the high school tutoring program involved getting approval from our principal, bringing the proper staff members at the high school on board, visiting the high school before every track change to speak in front of classes throughout

the school to recruit students to volunteer at our school during their vacations. I then had to coordinate which tutors would work in which classes and coordinate the logistics with our office and faculty. At the end of each tutoring cycle we usually had a "thank you" party for the tutors. I eventually arranged with our school's parent representative to have the District send each tutor a "thank you" certificate. A few of the tutors ended up asking me for college recommendation letters, to participate in a video project in one of their classes, and even to recommend one young woman for a national activism/service training institute. Eventually when the LA Clean and Green Program heard about us and requested to integrate their young people's service work into our tutoring program it also required me to coordinate with their city supervisor. (All this paid off right away, as I had the support of a great tutor in my class all the time!) The work I did as a District Intern personnel assistant adviser involved part-time work during a few of my vacations.

Obviously I knew that the P of PAR would be particularly taxing but I counted on the fact that the year-round school calendar at South Central provided four months of vacation each year during which time I could focus intensely on the R: the Research. The key to it all would be the A: the Actions I took to balance and produce the best results from the P and R.

Activist Anthropology: Reality

As it turned out the balance was very hard to find. My duties as a teacher, the P, kept me challenged and always, it seemed, tired. The R, research, was difficult, too. For example, while there were weeks when I conducted several interviews and took copious field notes, there were other weeks when I did none of either. These were weeks when the school event calendar was full (Thanksgiving time, first week of school, etc.) and no one had time for interviews or when, frankly, I was exhausted-- during these weeks when everything I was doing seemed to catch up to me, it was all I could do to jot down a few key words to jog my memory when I sat down later to write field notes. It was also sometimes hard to keep my field notes going as frequently as I wanted. I would be so

deeply involved in situations as a "participant" that my "observer" role sometimes had to wait.

Here is a typical scenario: A fascinating, spontaneous conversation about school politics in the teachers' cafeteria would abruptly end when the recess bell rang and I would have no time to take notes because I, too, had to go pick up my kids on the yard and teach a math lesson, then drop the kids off at lunch and stuff down my own food in order to have time to make copies of the homework for that night, then after lunch teach a social studies lesson, a music lesson and an ESL lesson, review the day and assign homework, drop the kids off on the yard and speak with parents, go right into a faculty meeting, and afterwards prep my materials for the next day's lessons. Only *then* would I have time to break out my hand-held tape recorder and dictate notes about the recess conversation (I kept a tape recorder in my desk, in my car and at home for this very reason--whenever I could find a second I dictated).

Other duties that I took on as part of my role as a teacher were all things that I had to do to be the best educator I could be--something I could not compromise on. I was either required to do them (serve on campus committees), offered the opportunity and privilege to do them (teaching courses in the District Intern program and working in the District's personnel office part-time during a few of my vacations), begged to do them (serving as our school's Standards Based Instruction Coordinator), or I saw such a need for them (founding and administrating our high school tutors program) that I could not *not* do them. I knew that it would make my fieldwork more arduous but it also enriched it. I was able to forge multiple roles in which to interact with school community members and personnel District-wide, giving me multiple angles of access to the people I wanted to talk to/observe. I became privy to situations and information I never would have otherwise. And my heart felt good doing it (like watching a high school tutor who had once themselves been a student at South Central Elementary help a first grader learn to read, seeing both their eyes light up, and then being able to support that tutor by writing a college recommendation letter--what else is there?).

It was frustrating, though, too. I often felt like an undesirable version of what Abu-Lughod (1991) calls a "halfie" anthropologist (Am I doing thorough enough fieldwork? I often worried). Feeling Ginsburg's (1989:X) idea of "shifting internal tectonics" and "schizophrenia" became a psychological norm. The balance I sought through the A in my PAR became very elusive when the professional work I was doing and my hopes and dreams for it became *just as* important to me as the research I was there to conduct in the first place. Constantly, constantly in my field notes I have double entries: information and reflections on my research data or dissertation process, and updates and reflections on my teaching successes and challenges. Talking about one was not complete without talking about the other. For example, here is one typical, brief field notes entry, from 9/21/99:

> It was a good day today. I had my own high school tutor and some other tutors help me after school. We got out of class early, 1:25, so after lots of work we were out of there by 3. Next Tuesday is Back to School Night. It will be a busy week. Tomorrow is also [*x* student's] Student Study Team meeting [to decide if he should be recommended for Special Education]. I'll get to school early tomorrow.
>
> There was no staff meeting called today so I guess I'll have to wait till the next staff meeting to introduce the School Community Seminars idea. I can't wait. People are interested so my fingers are crossed.
>
> I am finishing my diss. prospectus bibliography tonight, I hope to send the document to my committee chairs tomorrow. Wheeeew.

But when it came to rationalizing my expenditures of energy I did not often have the luxury of "doing it all." My decisions were sometimes heart-wrenching (imagine recurring questions like, What to do with my free time after school today--prepare supplementary lessons for my struggling readers who just need that little extra push... or analyze field notes? or, In the middle of this heated lunchtime conversation about bilingual teacher stipends should I participate passionately or take furious field notes?)

Behar (1996), Motzafi-Haller (1997), Kondo (1990), Nayaran (1993) and others write about the complexity, advantages and pitfalls of working in and through the personal experiences of fieldwork. Behar argues that exploring the anthropologist's motives and reactions to issues in the field can "take us somewhere we couldn't otherwise get to"(14). It can open a "Pandora's box," bringing into focus dynamics and questions that might never have gotten asked, and necessitating multiple answers to questions that might otherwise be one-sided (16,19).

My own Pandora's box always seemed to be open. Either way I answered my recurring questions the answer was never right, I never felt comfortable. So I tried to find a balance by sometimes analyzing field notes, sometimes preparing lessons; sometimes putting down my pen and immersing myself in conversations, sometimes sitting back and taking notes. I tried to find a balance by putting in extra hours in order to do some of everything. Particularly regarding my research, if at times I did not think I got out of my classroom enough to observe and interview I just visited when I was on vacation and wandered and talked all day.

And I accepted my split personalities. This aspect of my life became just like the politics that I analyze in this document: In one context one agenda or decision made sense, drawing upon a particular idea of legitimacy and participation and fairness and excellence. In another context another was required. These agendas and decisions lived together rationally and seamlessly, but *turbulently*.

And they continue to cohabitate in a rocky, codependent way in my writing. As I stated in the introductory chapter I have a political and practical reason for writing in my storytelling style, my almost casual way: I want to connect with people in schools and school communities. Yes, I want to engage academics, also. But akin to the experience of Motzafi-Haller (1997) I do not want "the prevailing academic discourse I [seek] to engage with" to somehow silence my personal voice, the soul space from which I ask, analyze and answer. In bell hooks' (1989) words, "to speak in a language accessible to all of us is a political choice about whom we are speaking to, whom we want to hear us, and whom we want to motivate with our words" (cited in Lipman 1998: 21). While we--

meaning teachers and other school community members--are eager for the latest in research that will help us make our schools better, we are not served by research reports that are in super elaborate, densely theoretical "academese." I have said myself as a classroom teacher and have had it said to me by teachers in my current work as an educational consultant, "Just tell me what I need to know. Just give me tools in useful terms." Not simplified, but to-the-point, practical, useful today.

So I have tried to find a voice in this document that uses sharp, sophisticated theory in the service of shaping an exploration and positioned explanations that do not read like "bloodless academic abstractions" (Motzafi-Haller 1997)--but that offer interesting and informative thought provokers for school community members and scholars… not "an answer" but one person's perspective thrown into the collective consideration. Who are we--meaning educational anthropologists-- really hoping to affect anyway, when it comes down to it? After we talk amongst ourselves don't we hope to engage with people *in schools*?

Professional Discussion Group

Here was my original plan for what I envisioned would be my major form of activism on campus: I would establish a regular meeting time (maybe monthly, I figured) for what I called School Community Seminars. I would start with teachers and once that got going also welcome TA's and Ed Aides, other staff and even parents. The SCS's would be forums where school community members could discuss issues of communication, politics, relationships, and practice; where we could solve problems and launch projects to make our school and community better. While I would offer to serve as facilitator and organizer I would not push my sole agenda. Participants (volunteers) could suggest readings and topics for our meetings; for my part I would encourage us to consider analyzing excerpts from my research data as dialogue starters. I hoped it would become a collaborative endeavor that would spur positive change on campus and improve the depth and complexity of my data collection and analysis.

The SCS's did not get started right away in 1998. Given the difficult time that I had even securing my teaching position because the vice principal was concerned about my research stirring up more conflict on campus, I wanted to tread lightly at first. During 1998-99 I stuck to my basic research. But during that year I casually inquired around about whether people felt that setting aside time for dialogue, reading, and reflection would be beneficial. I generally got answers like this teacher's: "Yes! We need to talk to each other about what we're feeling, about what's going on. We've had so much drama. Right now, we can't even hear the other *person* talking, it's all been so divided. We need to slow down and hear each other. And we need time."

Then one day in the summer of 99, before I had even begun an explicit campaign to establish SCS's, a friend and I were talking over lunch about school politics, my dissertation and her master's thesis research, and the ideals behind bilingual education and multicultural education theory. She lamented the need for teachers to talk with one another about issues of diversity, language, race and power in concrete and analytical terms. This need was especially great at our school, she said, given the programmatic changes we were experiencing, the continuing demographic shifts in the student population, the differing perspectives teachers bring to school, and the high turn-over rate of staff. Combining discussions of my research with discussions of topical literature and current events would be very beneficial for us, she said, because "there is so much that we do that is unconscious but that has important ramifications, how can we even reflect upon it until it comes out and becomes conscious through dialogue?" She then suggested something I might not have even dared--that I ask the principal to let me try facilitating these discussions as part of our UCTP time. She guessed that he would find it worthwhile, and making these discussions part of UCTP would guarantee more attendance because people could get paid for it. UCTP, the Urban Classroom Teacher Program, paid teachers in underperforming schools a stipend for a certain number of hours of service in addition to their regular duties. These activities had to be approved by the administration as of benefit to students and they usually took the form of tutoring.

I immediately took the idea to the principal. He was enthusiastic, saying,

> It's a great idea. They [District leadership] have told us [principals] that we need to address the kinds of social issues we face in our schools. Diversity and conflict need to be addressed, and we need to make time for this in our schedules. All the research shows that talking about these issues improves schools. We really need that here.

He said he would present the idea to the LEARN committee for approval and then I could present it to the faculty and get volunteers. He also approved my meeting with volunteer TA's and Ed Aides during my lunch period (which coincided with the time they got off work), and with volunteer parents and other staff members.

In October of 1999 the principal got what I was told was "enthusiastic support" for the idea from the LEARN committee. He had presented the idea as "Professional Discussion Groups," characterizing them as a continuation of the short-lived "Literature Circles" that Roslyn had facilitated in her time as Title I Coordinator (Literature Circles had been occasional discussion groups about professional literature during faculty professional development time after school. They had been enjoyed by teachers, I was told, but had fizzled out due to schedule constraints before I returned in 1998). I was so excited. This felt just like the kind of collaborative activism that I had hoped for. Not only did others get onboard and spearhead Professional Discussion Groups with me, but PDG's built on somewhat of a history of faculty discussion groups. And participation might be good given that teachers could get paid for it! I planned to present the idea to the entire faculty at our next available faculty meeting.

I was nervous, however. While many people already seemed receptive to the idea I knew many who might not want to participate or who might even be hostile towards such efforts. And even amongst enthusiastic participants, because topics of politics and change and practice were so hot, and because I planned to welcome critical questioning and public wondering, I could see the PDG's as a potential breeding ground destructive (as opposed to collegial, productive) critique of each other and maybe even of my research. I anticipated that making the PDG's a safe and productive space for everyone would be a challenge.

... Getting the idea of teacher PDG's off the ground

At the next faculty meeting I introduced the idea of the PDG's. Some very interesting questions were posed: One of my grade level colleagues asked if he could participate without doing any reading. The readings he had for his courses at the local university were too much already, he said. I answered that if participants preferred we could do any reading that we chose during the PDG itself, not outside, so as not to overload us. Because a large percentage of our staff was emergency credentialed like this colleague and so in a university or District Intern credentialing program, this was a concern that many shared. Janice commented (with sarcasm in her voice), "I thought we were supposed to be *tutoring* people during UCTP." Before I could respond the principal said, "Well, the students will benefit from our professional study." Janice was quiet and no one else spoke up. I did not pursue the question at that point. I passed around an interest sign-up sheet. Six people signed it. I was a little encouraged and a little discouraged after the meeting. I planned to bring up PDG's again to the faculty after the group got going and we had some experiences to share. Hopefully that would increase dialogue about the idea and participation. I would inquire later with Janice as to why there was discomfort with the idea.

... Not getting classified staff PDG's off the ground

Soon after that faculty meeting I asked a few TA's and Ed Aides if they would be interested in PDG's. Yes, they said. It was just a matter of me introducing the idea to everybody (classified staff--office, security, TA's and Ed Aides, cafeteria, and janitorial staff--all met separately). When I asked one of our campus security aides when her next staff meeting was she said she wasn't sure and then launched into a lengthy discussion of why she thought PDG's could be helpful in increasing communication and solving problems. She told me a story that gave another example of ways in which access to cultural citizenship seemed blocked for "African-American/EO" school community members: She explained that the several-person security staff had only two Black

members, herself and one other. When she recently asked Andrea about the next security staff meeting, "She [Andrea] told me that we did not have to attend. Aren't we part of the team? Don't I sit at the door and help keep the school safe?" She went on to give examples of times that she and the other Black security staff member had actually prevented security breaches and times when particular Latino security staff members had not been present to help prevent them. Then she reflected, "So why do [names a few Latino campus security aides] get hours as school security when all they do is sit in the office and talk and collect their paycheck? That's discrimination to me." I agreed that it sounded like an issue that needed to be addressed. Then I asked her if she was going to talk with Andrea about it. She said, "No, it won't do any good." I argued that it might and encouraged her to bring it up. She said she would think about it, maybe it was a good idea, and she was glad we had talked about it.

By this point I had confirmed that there was the potential for good participation in PDG's on the part of classified staff. In just bringing up the idea, I had already begun to hear stories that added to my data and understanding of the politics of cultural citizenship on campus; I had already begun to engage with people about communication and problem solving. I just needed to coordinate meeting times. But while I spoke with a few other people who might attend after that, I never even held that introductory meeting. I got so wrapped up in getting the teacher PDG's going that I put off the classified PDG's for awhile. Then, as we will see below, I was never able to turn my attention back to other PDG forums. .

... Teacher PDG's begin

By mid-November, 1999 we had nine people who had expressed interest in PDG's. On the 21st I sent out a reminder note that the next day would be our first meeting. It would be held after school during UCTP time; we had roughly an hour and a half. The agenda I hoped to complete was: Review my idea of what our group would be about; Discuss this and establish together our goals, format, etc.; Get suggestions for

discussion topics, readings, etc.; Look at the Atweh, Kemmis and Wilkinson (1998) action research article (if time permitted); Collaboratively create our next PDG agenda.

The next day three teachers attended. No one knew where the other six teachers were, but we continued, excited to finally be going. Regarding the format, we agreed that it would sometimes be productive to work as a whole group and sometimes in subgroups to address different issues as our interests dictated. Regarding meeting schedules, because of how teachers organized their weekly UCTP time, some suggested meeting Mondays and others, Thursdays. We decided to alternate weeks for each day so that everyone interested could make it; once we got higher levels of participation maybe we could solidify one day. One teacher then shared, "We have so much to say, so much to learn from each other, we should meet more! I want this group to feel like something I'm a part of, something that we can take as far as we want. It will be more personal, moldable. It will help us grow as a group."

Discussing PDG topics, I brought up action research theory and my research data. Questions I wanted the group to explore revolved around politics of language, race, immigration and community relations. I hoped we could problem solve around issues of inclusion and equity. Another teacher suggested examining the politics of teaching in high poverty urban schools. Questions he wanted to explore were, What can we do to help the community? How much does class play into politics? What is the connection between school and community? Just how much should we push for as activists? He also suggested a "make and take" idea--collaboratively creating standards-based lesson plans. Another teacher wanted to look at issues of communication and organization on campus. He wanted to address issues of lack of collaboration and resulting inefficiencies. Particularly attractive to him was the fact that we could set the agendas for our PDG's--they wouldn't be set by the administration. Personalized, meaningful professional development was hard to come by, we all agreed. Two colleagues who could not attend that day had submitted their ideas ahead of time: one suggested that the PDG study brain-based teaching and learning research, in order to increase the rigor of our instruction. The other, Linda, posed that we look at multicultural education articles, to address issues

of inequity on our campus. And everyone was excited about connecting our local interests to national-level politics; of understanding ourselves and our practice within the bigger picture.

As time ran out we decided to look at the action research article at our next meeting. The other participants wanted to meet again as soon as possible, during the first week of December. Since I was scheduled to be in Austin to defend my prospectus that week, I suggested that we set a date for the 17th. An after-school PDG would be difficult on the 17th, we knew, because we would be exhausted from the day's schedule--it was the day of our Winter Program, a series of performances and parties for students, faculty and parents. But, hopeful, we marked our calendars.

On the 17th no one showed up. But I was secretly relieved. I was exhausted from the day's events, and I ended up needing the time that afternoon to go get holiday gifts for my students (I hadn't done so yet and our last day before the winter break was the next). I would organize our second PDG for after break.

After that it seemed that things worked against my grand hopes for the PDGs. First was the track change, something that challenges all program and reform implementation at year-round multi-track schools. January was one of the times that one track went on vacation and one track returned from vacation. Hence, the PDG could not just pick up where we left off. I had to introduce the idea of Professional Discussion Groups to the entire third of the faculty that returned and reconstitute the group with new on-track members. Second, I was absent often in January and February--I was ill on-and-off, and for several days I was part of a group of teachers who attended the annual conference of The California Association for Bilingual Education in San Francisco.

It wasn't until early March, 2000 that schedules permitted discussion of PDG's at a faculty meeting. When the discussion did occur, it was encouraging: Teachers were enthusiastic and seventeen signed up! But that enthusiasm again met hurdles. Weeks went by when PDG's were impossible--we had parent conferences after school, full faculty meeting agendas, and a day when I was sick and missed the faculty meeting (I'm sure exhaustion contributed to my frequent illnesses those two years). During that time,

however, teachers often approached me to suggest articles to read and to ask when we were going to start. I kept responding, "Soon." But try as I might, as much as it disappointed me, "soon" became May. Even though interest still seemed high, I was concerned that the impending end of the school year would affect participation (after standardized testing in the spring, lots of things slow down). I put a flyer out to teachers outlining proposed dates for PDG's through the end of the year (the end of June), with the next meeting scheduled for the 18th.

At our second Professional Discussion Group on May 18th, four people attended. As the five of us sat there wondering where "everyone else" was, we looked back at the long sign-up list from March. Again the multi-track year-round schedule worked against us. Three quarters of the people who had signed up where now off-track! We move ahead anyway, excited. Linda shared with us the article she had mentioned for the last PDG, about the politics of equity for children in urban schools. We decided it would be great to read. As I tried to get the group to decide if we would read the article today or next time, it became clear that what they wanted to do that day was talk about recent campus events. I let the conversation go.

Linda and the new Bilingual Coordinator, who took Enrique's place and who was also on the LEARN committee, could not wait to know if we all had heard about the Title I Parent Council "drama" that was unfolding. We didn't know, so they launched into the story: Recently the Title I Parent Council had been trying to re-establish a regular meeting schedule after months of sporadic gatherings. The then-president of the Council--an African-American woman--said that the first date suggested was not good for her because she had to take a child to the doctor. Apparently, our storytellers said, at this point the other Council members--all Latinas--"decided to stick to their guns" and schedule the meeting for the first date suggested, "and if [the President] could not make it then she could not make it." This was a very "ironic happening," we were told, because "the Council had not stuck to their guns all year about anything except for now when the only Black committee member, the President no less, could not make it." Apparently the Bilingual Coordinator was at the meeting as the administrative representative and tried to

get the Council to change their minds. When they would not he took the issue to the principal who, he told us, decided to let the decision stand. We all agreed that we thought the decision by the Council members was race-based, an attempt to exclude the African-American parent. Why the principal didn't object to the decision we didn't know.

Linda then added that she thought this story was an example of how African-Americans at South Central Elementary were discriminated against, and that it fit right in with the sad fact that, as another example, the LEARN committee had not yet even tried to put in place the months-old recommendations of the Program Quality Review committee (which were meant to improve the academic program for African-American students). I asked her why she thought that was so and she said that the committee was embroiled in its own controversies which were affecting its functioning as a decision-making body. Since Linda was on the committee and I knew that Michael often brought the issues of inequity between "Latino/bilingual" and "African-American/EO" school community members to the LEARN forum, I asked if Michael's concerns were part of "the controversies" she referred to. She said yes, and then seemed to shift perspectives on the urgency and even validity of the issues. She said that in bringing them up, Michael was showing "immaturity," "whipping up race politics" for no reason. I disagreed with her, noting that Michael's position could be seen to build upon other things as well, for example the continuing disparity in student achievement scores and the fiascoes with the translators at the Parent Institutes (described in the previous chapter)--even the story she had just told. The other PDG participants were silent. Maybe, she said, and then she moved to close the conversation by noting the time.

Indeed UCTP time was up and the general consensus, by sighs and body language, was that it was time to go home. Basically it felt like people had had enough of talking and were tired. But I was excited--I had just learned of another incident that filled in the picture for me on the ways in which people thought about "African-American/EO"-"Latino/bilingual" politics, *and* I knew that this story, in conjunction with some quotes from my research, could be a fertile place to start at our next PDG. Yea, we had not gotten into the action research article or any of “my” data yet, but as Atweh, Kemmis and

Wilkinson (1998) argue, the criterion of successful Participatory Action Research is not whether the original steps are followed faithfully but whether the researcher and participants "have a strong and authentic sense of development and evolution in their practices" (21). I hoped that the day's free-flowing conversation could spark a series of richer, more structured discussions.

... Teacher PDG's End

This never happened. When I look back at why, it is almost hard for me to understand how I could have let the last month of school slip away without gathering interested PDG participants together in some way or another. Now, sitting in front of my computer it is uncomfortable to place myself back in the literal blur of tasks and activities that dominate the lives of teachers at the end of a school year: report cards, closing out student cumulative folders, culminating class projects, closing down our classrooms, doing the matrix for next year, ceremonies, field trips, etc.. At the time it didn't even feel like a "decision" to put off the PDG's. It was just what had to be done to get what "had to be done," done.

And just as I began to take stock of the fact that the PDG's might not ever really take off I had to confront my impending departure from South Central Elementary. I felt sad that I had to tell my friends I was leaving, and nervous to tell my principal. In early June I walked into his office and told him that I had just received a fellowship from the University, a fellowship that would allow me to take some time off and write; I would not be teaching next year. I would miss South Central but I hoped that the writing I would do about my research there would contribute to the dialogues and actions of educators, school communities and scholars everywhere as they--we--struggled to do the best for kids. He said that he was sad to see me go, and he approved my request to visit campus regularly the next year to try to continue the Professional Discussion Groups (and conduct more interviews).

And then something extraordinary happened: My colleagues decided to carry on the activist efforts! First, Linda and a new teacher on the faculty decided to take over the

high school tutors program. They had some great ideas for increasing participation and for mentoring the tutors. This was exciting because so many teachers had thanked us for "giving" them tutors, and the tutors and students made such strong connections that the tutors started hanging out with us what seemed like all the time. We teachers were writing some tutors college application reference letters and participating in some of their high school media class projects (being video interviewed about teaching in the inner city). And word was spreading: "L.A. Clean and Green," a city program for teenagers to volunteer on projects to improve their local communities, was now sending us volunteers (the Clean and Green coordinator had heard good things about our program and contacted me--we had dozens of C and G tutors by the time I left!).

Then another teacher who had attended one Professional Discussion Group meeting decided that he wanted to take over coordinating the scheduling and recruitment if I would facilitate. We agreed. I was glad there would be a full-time cheerleader of sorts for the PDG's on campus. We scheduled the next meeting for the end of July. I took these as signs that the work I/we began really meant something to the school community. Maybe I had just been impatient. It seemed that a strong and authentic sense of development and evolution in *our* practices was budding.

Leaving South Central Elementary (again!) was hard. During the last few weeks of June I took rolls of pictures of my students, of my colleagues, of the high school volunteers, even of the school grounds. When school began again the first week of July and I was not there in a classroom, I already missed everybody. A lot. I was glad that I would still be around now and then for the PDG's and more interviews. But while my official departure was hard on my heart it was easy on my mind and body. It was good to have time to concentrate on my research, data analysis and writing without having to also teach (and all that *that* meant). I dove into my data.

The end of July rolled around and on the 27th I returned to campus for the next PDG. The teacher coordinator had been talking it up, the principal had put a notice about it in the staff weekly bulletin and an announcement was made at the afternoon bell reminding interested participants to meet in the library. No one showed except for the

teacher coordinator. We waited 45 minutes and then gave up (we didn't want to proceed alone). We rationalized that it was probably just the crush of beginning-of-the-year activities that was keeping people away. We would try again next month. He volunteered to speak at the next faculty meeting about it, to recapture the interest that had begun to build last year. I was again disappointed but I did not lose the opportunity to arrange two interviews for the following week. And it was good to be back, to see everyone. Two weeks later the teacher coordinator e-mailed me. He wrote, "Dear Kim, Forget it! We did not have a faculty meeting last week so I asked today and no one showed interest. I tried to explain the purpose, but hey, sorry... Anyhow, I hope everything is fine with you. Thanks for trying and take care!" And just like that the Professional Discussion Groups fizzled out.

A few weeks later I visited campus to interview a teacher and stopped by to chat with the principal before I left. I asked him why he thought there was no continuing interest in the PDG's. He said he thought it was because of the implementation of the Open Court Reading program. (Many schools in the LAUSD adopted Open Court that year as part of literacy reform, and most other schools have followed since. It is a comprehensive, complex program that involves extensive, ongoing training for teachers.) He explained,

> It's all OCR now, it seems, everything we do. And on top of that we have a young staff and they're going to school [credentialing programs] after school, they don't have time to meet and do more reading and discussions after school. I would have liked to free them up at least once a month during a staff meeting time for professional discussions but I don't have that luxury. The agendas are overwhelmed with new stuff to do and information I have to share with people. Teachers have burned out. We wanted to do it, I thought it was a great idea. We need to do it. But we're just burned out.

Reflecting on Participatory Action Research and Whiteness

Two things stand out to me as I reflect on the Professional Discussion Groups. First, I think part of the reason the effort died was because of the difficulty I had in finding the balance between Participation and Research. Had I worn a hat or two less on campus and around the District I might have had more time to work on the PDG's. But who knows; at that time I struck the balance that I felt was necessary *as an anthropologist and as a teacher*. The discomfort that I felt--and feel--with it seems to be an unavoidable symptom of halfie-ness, of split personalities.

Again I find that that a dilemma I encountered around PAR paralleled tensions in some of the internally-contradictory policy agendas of school community members: the dilemma of creating something new with only the building materials of the present at hand (in Gal's [1994: 259] words). I wonder if with the different "building materials" of a different role on campus I could have supported PDG's over the long run? Perhaps, if I had not been a teacher full-time but a more conventional anthropologist on campus, as a visitor and with a flexible schedule, I could have pursued PDG institutionalization more intensely? Yet, without the insider positionality of teacher I might not have been able to secure support for and interest in the idea in the first place so easily. Without it I might not have really known what it was teachers and school community members wanted and needed to address, analyze, discuss and act upon.

And, important for conceptualizations of activist anthropololgy, it was not just *my* struggling with the dilemma of practice vs. inquiry. As I found out in the winter of 2000, I could have had all the time in the world for PDG's but the exigencies of the school wide Open Court program implementation might have squashed them anyway. And so the very reason that I wanted to create forums in which people could dialogue and launch school community improvement efforts--because teachers and others are so caught up in "the tyranny of the urgent" of everyday practice that thoughtful, reflective, and collaborative actions become an extreme challenge to accomplish--became a major force in stifling that creation.

And then one of Behar's "questions that might not have otherwise gotten asked" arose: I wondered (regardless of whether I was a teacher/insider or not) if I "really knew" what issues people wanted to address, or how my fellow school community members envisioned such a communal forum. I knew through my experience, research and friendships that people *across* the school community wanted to talk, to analyze, to coalesce, to change for the better the ways we lived together on campus. That was the very reason I undertook the research questions I did in 1998. Everybody *knew* we needed to do it. And I felt that once momentum got going there would be nothing that could stop the effort from becoming truly school wide.

But now I wonder, what is activism, anyway? I question the way I went about spearheading the effort, because the second thing that stands out to me as I reflect on the PDG's is that interest in them was mostly from white and Latino school community members; participation was all white and Latino; and because the only public questioning (that I am aware of) of the appropriateness of PDG's came from an "African-American/EO" school community member. Perhaps my whiteness and bilingual program association made the endeavor unattractive or even threatening to "African-Americans/EO" folks. The "Latino/bilingual" and "African-American/EO" sides had been constructed as pitted against each other for so long both locally and in national level discourses. Given this, why would people assume that a discussion group facilitated by a bilingual—and white—teacher would address "African-American/EO" concerns?

Perhaps many people didn't know about my support of dual language immersion education for "African-American/EO" students and my goal of increasing dialogue about and improvement of the education of our Black children as well as of our Latino children. Perhaps they didn't know about my desire to critically interrogate whiteness as part of our school's "Black-Brown" conflict. I had expressed many views that could be characterized as "African-American/EO" over the last two years and in 1996, but mostly with people one-on-one and in small groups. I had never done so in any more of a public context (I had never stood up in a faculty meeting to introduce the topic, for example). *That's what I was hoping to do through the PDG's*—make a safe, communal space for *us*

to be constructively critical, to question, to brainstorm solutions, to see connections across constructed lines of difference and reveal the frequent border crossing that *many* of us were doing; something we were never offered the opportunity to do in our regular schedules and according to regular public interaction patterns. And I wanted to do it by capitalizing on the power of people coming to the task voluntarily.

Here is an example of a moment when I made the choice to postpone the expression of strong political feelings I had in order to a) get the technical work we were doing at the moment done and b) fulfill the particular vision for activism that I had. It was the spring, 2000 meeting (mentioned in the previous chapter) with great level chairpeople that I held as our Standards Based Assessment Coordinator, to organize the administration of the upcoming Performance Assessments. The group comprised two "African-American/EO" teachers (including Elizabeth) and three "Latino/bilingual" teachers (including Linda and myself). As we reviewed class rosters to confirm how many students were classified English Only or Fluent English Proficient (only they would officially take the test), Linda told us that she had eight students who were doing grade level work in English (in her Model B class). She was not going to officially redesignate them, though, because if she did the number of students in her class who were classified Limited English Proficient would drop below the number she needed to receive her bilingual stipend. Here are my reflections on that moment from my field notes:

> With attitude she said that she deserved her stipend, she wanted it, and at the end of the year she would tell their next teacher where they really were. We all looked at her, shocked. Then I broke the silence by saying, "Whoa, hot topic!" I could not believe she said that with such attitude, as if there were nothing wrong or objectionable with it. In the moment questions about my activism flashed before me—what forms does/can it take, and when? I argued with myself about whether to say something more committed than "hot topic." I argued that I *should* because I could engage key staff members in a conversation about bilingual stipends and "cheating" on 227/bilingual program policy mandates--points of contention in ongoing conflict. I should because I could share and engage others more publicly and officially (in a way, in my role as an official program coordinator at the school) around my views that crisscross the supposedly opposing agendas of the "Latino/bilingual" and "African-American/EO" sides. I should because I am an

> insider ethnographer; because "activism happens"—why wait for a PDG? I argued with myself that I *shouldn't* say anymore at that moment because I could see what others might do without my prodding; what ever that was it could be used as a powerful conversation starting scenario in the next PDG and we could really get into it in an extended dialogue then—this Performance Assessments meeting had to end in a few minutes, we still had several logistics to cover about the administration of the test, and this was the only time we had to do it. None of us could hang out after the bell rings to keep talking no matter how interesting the topic. I ended up not saying anything else at the moment. I talked with the people at the meeting later on when I ran into them in the hall or on the yard. Then I shared with them my opinions on Linda's statement and they shared with me theirs. They all agreed that this was a perfect distillation of an important aspect of our campus conflict and they gave me permission to share what went on at the next PDG.

By waiting and hoping to address hot political topics in the PDG's I effectively held back in a potentially key moment of school community member dialogue--an authentic in-process moment, not a pre-planned meeting moment. While individuals knew my positions on the issues they weren't common public knowledge, and even when individuals knew it might not have been worth much when I didn't aggressively vocalize them through existing public communication channels in the school community (e.g. at times like this and in faculty meetings). Another example of inaction on my part was that I also never found out from Janice why she opposed the PDG's. We spoke at times after her opposition to the idea at the faculty meeting, about other aspects of campus dynamics but the fact that I never scheduled a specific time to talk to her about the PDG's was a serious omission. I know why some other "African-American/EO" school community members were averse to the idea. Mary for example said that she didn't want to be quoted in a PDG or to participate because, "I trust you, Kim, but I don't want other people knowing what I say. It will just incite more trouble. Talking any more about this stuff, about bilingual education, it could tear this school apart." I know that this feeling of lack of safety and the desire not to be "the matchstick" that ignited more conflict was shared by others regarding avoidance of the PDG's, but I never found out what Janice's reasoning was. Honestly, I think partly it was time and exhaustion (I didn't follow up on many things I could have over the two years–I could only do so much given everything I

was involved in) and partly avoidance of conflict on my part. So in these examples, by waiting and hoping instead of acting at that moment, and by not following up with a key contention from a key voice in the conflict I could be seen to effectively inhabit a typical white mode of being at the school: withdraw, disconnection.

Indeed Behar (1996) was right. Exploring one's motives and reactions to issues in the field can "take us somewhere we couldn't otherwise get to"(14). It can open a "Pandora's box," bringing into focus dynamics and questions that might never have gotten asked, and necessitating multiple answers to questions that might otherwise be one-sided (16,19).

Looking back on my experiences with PAR and my impulses and responses to events as a white school community member now makes me question my original vision for activist anthropology at South Central Elementary. Maybe setting out to create a *new* institution (Professional Discussion Groups during UCTP time) was not the best way to facilitate dialogue, critical reflection, coalition building and problem solving. Maybe I should have advocated a strategy for injecting these processes into the *existing* patterns and structures of communication and interaction in the community. Maybe the 1996 norm of expressing conflict head-on, at the moment, in whatever public context arose was the best way to process the issues. Maybe I could have engaged in more critical dialogue with my interviewees, at the moment, one-on-one, making interviews more like conversations--for example with Michael when he identified and critiqued my whiteness in his descriptions of the politics of bilingual education (quoted in previous chapter). Maybe it was just *my* terms of engagement of activism that needed transformation.

Another possibility is this: I/we PDG supporters could have pushed to have the "hot topics" on campus put on regular staff and faculty meeting agendas, inserted into professional development activities and included in discussions during parent meetings. I could have joined the influential LEARN Council and vocalized/offered my questions and data findings there. It would have been difficult to add to our already packed regular meeting agendas, but I think there was enough desire to solve problems amongst school community members on all sides of the issues to sustain inquiry, dialogue and action had

the "hot topics" been pulled out of the undercurrent and given center stage again. So while I don't think the PDG's were a bad idea, as a Participatory Action Researcher maybe my/our goals might have been better served had I conferred with more school community members more thoroughly before establishing the PDG's as the format for action. Maybe it was very "academic" and very "white" of me to think that I had to "add to" the school community instead of going with the flow of it or digging deeper into it. I hope to answer this question more thoroughly in the future, which I hypothesize about below.

What's next?

As of the writing of this chapter it has been two and a half years since I have visited South Central Elementary. I began my current job with The Achievement Council in February, 2001. This job now has me spending my days on the campuses of the schools that I coach and my nights writing. I have talked to friends on staff and they are excited for me to visit and share my work; I do hope to do so as soon as this document is finished.

I must be careful how this return is structured and what my goals for it are. If I want feedback about my data and analysis in order to enrich further writing on this project I could follow Foley's (1995) example and provide participants ways to tell or write me their feedback. While that could provide valuable information it might encounter the difficulty that Page, Samson and Crockett (1998) found when they returned to the schools in which they had done ethnographies. They found that staff members responded positively or negatively to their write-ups in direct relationship to the extent to which they *felt* personally criticized in the documents. Past that Samson and Crockett found it difficult to elicit in-depth feedback or reflection. As I critique *everyone's* positions at South Central Elementary at one time or another, I can only hope that I might have a different outcome than Page, Samson and Crockett. If I want to pick up where I left off, in a sense, after I finish this document I could try to arrange a series of visits to

campus, if there is interest, to invite/facilitate dialogue about the project's insights for current school politics. I think my goals for continued work with South Central Elementary will depend upon the desires and needs of *all* current school community members, though, not just of representatives from some of the groups on campus. I plan to visit and to explore possibilities as soon as I finish this document.

What *could* be next

It is difficult to know just what will be the most effective kind of inquiry and activism for my school and for other schools. In my coming to and going from South Central over the last 12 years, I'm never really all in one world (that of insider) or the other (that of outsider). What I hope is that over time, being sometimes ontologically inside and sometimes outside the community there is a "collapsing the categories of native and non-native, subject an object, researcher and subject of study"; and I hope that that constant shifting of viewpoint affords me a comparative perspective that makes me "a better, not less able, anthropologist and analyst" (Motzafi-Haller 1997: 219).

Even now I can be seen to inhabit a certain "halfie-ness" even though I am not on the payroll at South Central Elementary. In my current work, while I write this dissertation, as a coach-consultant to schools in the LAUSD I have seen in District-wide data and at dozens of schools first-hand that many, many campuses are struggling with versions of what we struggled with at South Central. Most schools have some version of conflict between sectors of the school community distinguished by race, ethnicity and/or language, and equity issues between students in those sectors. And on top of that most schools are dealing locally with the national trend in teacher-student demographics: Proportionally, more and more new teachers are white and middle-class, in classrooms with increasing numbers of Latino, African-American, Asian-American, and Native American working-class children (Hochschild and Scovronick 2003)—dynamics that certainly do not make dealing with politics around race, language, immigration/nation and power any easier.

With all the schools that I work with the major thrust of my work as coach-consultant is to work with them intensely during the year to facilitate their school leadership teams' (comprised of administration, teacher and parent leaders) own Participatory Action Research (of a sort, although we do not call it that): I facilitate their analysis of their student achievement and other data, I support their planning for addressing inequities in outcomes and the issues of school community culture that impact outcomes, for monitoring progress towards their goals, and I support them as they implement their plans. In some cases I become akin to a school community member myself, and there are moments when our team dialogues feels like my vision for a Professional Discussion Group. This is a big step forward institutionally, the District providing schools with on-going support from a coach to engage more thoroughly than usual in these processes. Even still my teams' biggest struggle at the school sites, just like at South Central, has been carving out the time for participants to engage thoroughly *enough* in these processes to affect the dramatic changes that are necessary to bring about cohesive, inclusive, high-performing educational communities.

This is especially important in the near future, also, because the long-term implications of conflict over bilingual education and English Immersion may go un- (or under-) addressed as communities large and small must *increasingly* address dynamics of demographic, linguistic, cultural and power shifts. The last time I was at South Central Elementary, in 2000, I asked the principal how the logistics of Proposition 227 implementation were going. He responded, "Oh, it's all Open Court right now. We're not even talking about 227 anymore. It's all Open Court, all our professional development, all our focus." But the mandate of English Immersion still existed/exists, and the issues that sparked the "war" in 1996 still exist, as I mentioned above encountering them on school campuses across the District. In 2003, as I finish writing this document, this new policy context of high-stakes accountability and the implementation of comprehensive programs such as Open Court should move myself and other educational anthropologists to undertake future activist ethnographies that ask the underlying questions about cultural

citizenship and community that people on campuses (to quote my colleagues in 1996) say, "We really need to talk about this. We need to address this."

CHAPTER 7: CONCLUSIONS: WHAT? SO WHAT? NOW WHAT?

In my current work as a coach/consultant to schools I often use these three questions--*What? So what? Now what?* (Rice 2003)--to frame the data inquiry processes that I facilitate for campus leadership teams. The questions are helpful for organizing the data we look at, for giving it meaning, and for prompting us to use it effectively in the improvement process. In true PAR style I adopt this technique from my practical field activities, my "teacher" mode, to help me do this for my own data, to strengthen my "research" mode. In this last chapter I will answer these questions by way of conclusion.

What?

My first two research questions were, 1) How did people at South Central Elementary struggle to define the community and its parameters for cultural citizenship through debates about the controversial language policies that shifted dramatically in the 1990s, from pre-through post-Proposition 227-how did politics and the educational environment on-campus change over time? And, 2) how did Latino, African-American and white school community members employ discourses about language, immigration, America, race and power; how did these articulate to widely-circulating media discourses on these topics; what does this illuminate about how they experienced and constructed their relationships to each other and to national-level political discourses and dynamics; and what does this tell us about the co-constructed nature of politics and lived experience at local and national sites?

As I examined all the ways in which people imagined the community and their's and each other's place within it--both locally and nationally--I found that at the heart of this supposed conflict over a particular *policy*, with agendas constructed as *opposing* (either bilingual education or EO/English Immersion), the actual *shared* struggle for inclusion, voice and value in the *policy process*: People on both sides admitted to me at one time or another that they agreed with the "other side's" policy position. Their issue was not with the bilingual education or EO/English Immersion policy itself but with the fact that they felt they had "no say" in how or why the policy was implemented. They

connected to or challenged national media discourses and political movements about language/s in school, race, Americanness, immigration, etc. as necessary to claim legitimate space from which to construct a policy context that *would* allow them a "say," a voice that was heard in discussions about who we were and what is meant for the proper education of our students.

Both pre- and post-227, language/s in school could be seen as a complex topic through which people at South Central Elementary could focus agendas and efforts to acquire a full "say," full cultural citizenship. The policy environment shifted drastically from pre-two post-227 contexts, going from one where the bilingual program was institutionally strong and supported to where English Immersion was dominant. However I did not find an analogous major shift in politics. Race as connected to language and then tied to pedagogy-- Latino laminated to Spanish/bilingual and African-American to English/EO -- continued to index how people experienced and constructed differential access to opportunity, value, inclusion, and voice. People constructed their own side's legitimacy and the delegitamacy of the other side's agenda through stories about greed, lust for power, racism, lack of appropriate professional knowledge, and inferior culture. They regularly did so by articulating politically-charged local terms such as "immigrant," "bilingual," "Spanish," "Black," and "EO" to politically pregnant discourses in the national media about the pros and cons of immigration and multilingualism, race relations, what is and isn't culturally or linguistically "American," and the role of public education in fairness and opportunity in the nation.

Pre-227 people could also be seen to *simultaneously counter*, or talk back to, the popular media pragmatics of these very terms and discourses. I found that whether people drew upon or challenged the media discourses depended on the context within which they considered their struggle for cultural citizenship. Within the local arena one agenda made sense while considering the national scale another was needed: considering the national context of demographic shifts and increasing globalization Latino/bilingual school community members argued for the expansion of bilingual education, while considering local dynamics of competition for resources and opportunity with African-

American/EO school community members they argued for limiting the program to *only* Latinos. Considering the national context African-American/EO school community members argued for the need to teach and value only English, while acknowledging local economic and cultural shifts led to the argument for the expansion of the bilingual program into a dual language program for *all* students. In this time of great change both demographically and programmatically (and administratively and organizationally), there seemed to be a sense of agency or space for possibility in the school community, and people fought vociferously for their agendas. The feeling of all-out attacks and defenses was palpable.

Post-227 the environment was one of chaotic programmatic and organizational shifts. Though there were a few on both sides who felt the conflict subsided post-227, most people felt that "the other side" "got what they wanted" from 227, and that their side was still denied full cultural citizenship. The general lines of conflict and points of debate remained the same. Key terms in the new policy context were molded to fit the hegemonic understanding of how lines of division in struggles for full cultural citizenship were drawn: English Immersion (Model A and Model B) came to *mean* "bilingual," and "Latino/bilingual" and "African-American/EO" continued to be the powerful metacommunicative discourses that shaped people's constructions of events and relationships. As both sides continued to struggle for cultural citizenship, their agendas continued to be fractured and context-driven: Vis-à-vis the national-level media constructions of America is an English-speaking nation, the "African-American/EO" side argued for more English and fewer bilingual waivers in our implementation of 227, while considering the increasingly-hegemonic constructions in the media of America as "Amexica," I found a softening in the anti-bilingual education agenda. The idea of limited bilingual instruction was considered acceptable, as long it was not placed in direct competition for resources with the EO program-- as long as both "Americas" portrayed in the national media could coexist on equal footing. Considering the continuing local economic and cultural trends there were still those who voiced a keen desire for bilingual education for Latino and Black students. On the "Latino/bilingual" side, within local

dynamics 227 was experienced largely as a chaotic and hostile attack, and saving bilingual education was seen as the defense. And even amongst the few on this side who felt that 227 was a positive force on campus, most people ended up arguing for saving bilingual education when they considered national level politics and discourses the context-- bilingual instruction, it was argued, would prepare (again, only Latino) students properly for living in "Amexica."

And not only did I find how the local agendas and discourses seemed to speak to and against the national, but looking "in reverse," if you will, at context, I argue that the micro can be seen to *affect* the macro: The important shift from the clear dominance of anti-bilingual education discourses within assumptions of America as an English *only* speaking nation in media discourses in 1996 to that in 1998-2000 of more equally matched anti- and pro-bilingual instruction agendas within dominant characterizations of the nation as increasingly racially, culturally and linguistically diverse. In the previous chapter I talked about this as the media representations "finally catching up" to the dynamics that the South Central Elementary school community have been doing with for years. Perhaps this is too simple a conclusion, but one could argue that as the sheer number of local cases where transformational demographic shifts were experienced increased rapidly between the early-mid 1990s to the late 1990s, as the media and national-level agenda setters drew on local cases for juicy quotes, human interest angles and statistics it was inevitable that characterizations of these changed communities changed the characterization of the whole. What this tells us about the co-constructed nature of politics and lived experience at local and national sites is just that--that they are indeed *thoroughly* co-constructed and *inter*dependent upon each other for context. How this relationship functions is not static or "reliable," however. I think it is just what ethnography exposes case-by-case.

Overall at South Central Elementary in 1998-2000, there was so much chaos in the implementation of Proposition 227, people often did not know if they themselves or each other were doing what they were supposed to be doing, what that might mean, who to ask or what the answers were. And there didn't seem to be an end in sight in the near

future to this: 227 was here to stay. It did not go to mediation and annulment like prop 187. The demographic shift in the community continued, with Latinos and immigrants comprising increasing percentages of the student body. Culturally, Spanish still had a valued place in community interactions. All these factors may have contributed to the fact that there seemed to grow a sense of inevitability, of lack of possibility or space in policy and politics at the time. Additionally, there was now more movement across the programmatic EO/bilingual boundary, more people teaching classes of mixed EO, bilingual, and immersion programs. While the conflict continued it did so to a less intense degree.

White people, while active in the conflict both pre- and post-227, were discursively erased from this "Black-Brown war." Their participation was almost universally characterized as "bilingual" or "EO" depending on which program they were associated with, and they opted out (and were excused from) accountability in school politics through such tropes as color blindness, naivete of race politics, or being "above" the irrationality of racial conflict. White*ness*, however, was a dynamic force in the conflict--it operated in and between subject positions (MacCannell 1992, Dominguez 1986, Ellsworth 1987, Fanon 1967). I found that certain discourses and assumptions that are usually typified in the literature as "white" were employed by people of all backgrounds on campus, for example Latinos and African-Americans occasionally drew upon discourses of color blindness, rationality or culture of poverty to justify their constructions of the "war" and to legitimize their agendas. This may offer us insight into two aspects of politics of cultural citizenship: both claims to cultural citizenship ("self-making"), as discussed by Flores and Benmayor (1997), and the limited and exclusionary entryways to cultural citizenship determined by the dominant ("subject-ificatioin" in the Foucaldian sense), as highlighted by Ong (1996). That people of color on campus favored these discourses typified as "white" in order to legitimize their policy agenda and delegitimize that of the other side (in order to "self-make") may speak to their cognizance of the narrow road to belonging, voice, and access to opportunity in America--it must be,

in some way, shape, or form, white (they submitted to or engaged with the "subject-ification" of American citizens).

The "fizzling" out of the PDG's also gave me another key opportunity to reflect on whiteness-- and on how I inhabit(ed) my whiteness. Interest (so far as I knew) in and attendance at the Professional Discussion Groups was only by "Latino/bilingual" and white school community members. This, even though "African-American/EO" school community members often shared with me one-on-one their opinion that people at South Central needed to communicate about the conflict we were engaged in (a major goal of the PDG's). I came to wonder if my forging ahead with the PDG idea without public support from "African-American/EO" school community members was a "very white" thing to do--i.e. if it indicated an (unreflective, unacknowledged) assumption on my part of being removed from or "above" the "Black-Brown" conflict--I knew the interest was there and I assumed participation from all groups in the school community would build over time. But perhaps the project was undertaken in such a way that it seems to come from a place of imposition and not collaboration.

In examining these dynamics of cultural citizenship, I also started out my project in 1998 with the third question, 3) What insights could being an insider, teacher-activist-ethnographer, provide on my questions, and could my research contribute to local struggles for cultural citizenship and improved practice during this time of drastic programmatic change? Could I make "reflexive anthropology" (Jacobs-Huey 2002) work? My answer is a provisional yes. The multiple roles I filled in addition to my position as third grade teacher gained me multiple opportunities and perspectives from which to engage people around experiences, opinions and agendas (that were often sensitive and highly-charged in this time of chaotic change), and from which to analyze data. They also imposed multiple accountabilities that sometimes took energy away from my research process (traditionally conceived).

These dual contexts within which I functioned imbued me with a deeper understanding of how the overlapping local and national contexts within which many South Central Elementary school community members understood and acted upon the

politics of bilingual education, functioned. It was a distinct, oppositional push and pull, a complex set of considerations all valid yet more or less powerful depending on the moment. I think a key insight into my research questions here is that these oppositional pushes and pulls could have been (can be) made to complement each other and to work better together, or to play off one another better *for actual practical benefit*, when brought into closer dialogue and mutual consideration--instead of just acknowledging their co-existence, their co-constitutive nature. For example, when zero-sum games are played with policy implementation decisions such as the implementation of bilingual education or English Immersion, Professional Discussion Groups can be forums where actual data on school community member perspectives, interpretations and agendas is considered to help make transparent the connections between policy requirements, moral valuations, decision making processes, and priorities within campus communities. PDG's can be places where school community members analyze connections between local needs and national concerns and histories--where connections can be made across borders of assumed difference and competition. When people can see that the "places we stand" in relation to each other and to national structures of participation are interdependent, we may become less likely to hide our border crossing (for example "African-American/EO" teachers who admitted to me their support for bilingual education in theory but who publicly fought its establishment on our campus, and "Latino/bilingual" teachers who admitted to me their support for the rationale for 227 but who publicly fought its implementation on our campus). Borders can then become creation zones, places where collaborative efforts to improve the educational environment for *all* school community members can begin their presencing (Bhabba 1994).

So as to whether the teacher-activist component of my research project actually helped improve practice at this chaotic time on the South Central campus, without a doubt, several aspects of my activism impacted the community positively. The tutoring program with the high school students that I founded brought academic support and positive role models for our students, and logistical help for classroom teachers. As coordinator of the Standards Based Assessment program I helped support teachers

through a time of great change in instruction and accountability. As an instructor in the District Intern program I contributed to the professional growth of some of the District's badly needed new teachers, and working as a DI representative in the personnel branch of the District I helped prospective teachers make choices about their career and the District make choices about their prospective teachers. And finally, in my most cherished role as "Ms. Anderson," third grade teacher, I did the best job I could to provide my students with an excellent education.

With the Professional Discussion Group I hoped to establish forums for teachers and eventually other school community members to engage in collaborative dialogue, analysis, reflection and problem-solving around issues of cultural citizenship (using my research data as one spark for this). The PDG's produced both the biggest excitements and the biggest disappointments of my 1998-2000 research period: Not only did other school community members find the idea worth while, they spearheaded it with me, established it within the institutional structure of the school community itself --UCTP time-- and took up the torch of continuing it after I left; as well the PDG's gave me great inroads to data I might not otherwise have been privy to. However PDG's never fully blossomed and the endeavor ended up fizzling out when I left. Upon reflection a small way in which the PDG's may have helped improve practice at the time was that at least in the discussions of the idea on the school's LEARN council and with the faculty, the idea of collaborative reflection and problem-solving was repeatedly raised and the need for it acknowledged. We never got far enough into the full functioning of the group, though, to claim any benefit to practice from them. Though I am sure of neither, perhaps the PDG's could have been more successful if one, I had balanced my energies better in order to put more time into the project, or two, if time for the kind of dialogue and problem-solving we sought had been *worked into the institutional structure differently*, for example moved from UCTP time into the existing professional development calendar. It's hard to know now.

Throughout this research and activist project I found it fruitful to follow post-Marxist, critical cultural studies scholars such as Hall (1988, 1996) and Gilroy (1987),

anthropologists of education who explore cultural production such as Levinson, Foley and Holland (1996), linguistic anthropologists who explore the language of politics and politics as language such as Urciouli (1996), Hill (1989, 1998), Woolard (1994) and Gal (1989, 1994), in order to study and then *study through* dichotomies (Policy mandate/policy processes, hegemonic/counterhegemonic, Black/Brown, bilingual/EO, language/race, researcher/researched). More, working on more than just one research site (multisited ethnography, Marcus 1998) and utilizing discourse analysis (Gee, Michaels and O'Connor 1992) were well-suited methodologies for understanding the complexities of politics of cultural citizenship. Conducting fieldwork on campus and at the level of popular media debates I was able to "follow the conflict" through the local terrain at South Central Elementary and in regional and national media coverage of controversies over bilingual education/English Immersion, immigration, changing demographics and race, and the identity of "America." Through the analysis of discourse within and across these sites (the organization of narration, performative utterances) I was able to get a feel for "how people's worlds were put together, particularly power relations" (Urciuoli 1996: 1, 2). In particular, examining how the pragmatics of key symbols/metacommunicative discourses shifted or remained the same (following Roediger, 1991) as people negotiated drastic policy shifts provided a view on what was at stake in the moves to impose a certain vision and order and relationship to the world of practice on campus *and* to larger/national structures of participation and opportunity (Bourdieu 1991). It enabled me to see some of the key forces and opportunities that animated the formation and endurance of interpretive communities within struggle, as well as how the lines of these interpretive communities were porous and negotiated in struggle (Gilroy 1987). It gave me a window of understanding into why the language education policy became *the* focal point of a much more multifaceted struggle for belonging, voice and opportunity within a community in transition.

So what?

I believe that my findings have important implications for several distinct though overlapping concerns and groups of readers/practitioners.

I believe that a few key policy implications of bilingual education programs and "English For the Children" Proposition 227 have surfaced through this research. First and foremost, unlike how their hegemonically portrayed in the media, these policies are much more than just a "Latino issue." I believe I have shown the South Central Elementary "war" and its 227 aftermath to be an exemplary case of struggles that increasing numbers of school communities face every day in the US. As we struggle to educate students well and to prepare them for productive participation in local and national communities and in the global economy, the question of what language/s to do this in is paramount--for Latinos, African-Americans, language minority groups more generally and indeed *all* of us.

Second, consensus on the success or failure of these policies seemed near impossible: Locally, both the "African-American/EO" and "Latino/bilingual" "sides" of the school communities generally felt that the other side had the upper hand pre-227, and that they "got what they wanted" with 227. The fact that there was little change in the pragmatics of key discursive symbols from 1996 to 1998 and that new policy/pedagogical terms were fit into these old molds as the conflict continued even when the supposed issue at hand (bilingual instruction) was institutionally hampered locally and largely dismantled across the state, is important. In the "macro" (state/national) context, also, no one could be seen to clearly "win" debates about the need for or success of 227. Experiences and statistics were called upon to show both bilingual education's and 227's success *and* failure, and oppositionalites (generally, pro-bilingual versus anti-bilingual) remained the same both pre- and post-227. Yet this is not an indictment of English Immersion or bilingual education policy. Rather, it speaks volumes about the importance of understanding policy as both received directive and contested cultural resource as communities local and national negotiate enduring, intertwined cultural, political, power, and material dynamics--I believe it necessitates consideration of a particular set of findings from research on instructional reforms and school organization models (e.g. Lein et al. 1996, Hilliard 1991, Lipman 1998): The success or failure found often turns out to be much less an issue of The Program or The Model and more a reflection of the human

dynamics undergirding implementation processes-- the extent to which beliefs about and expectations for children and adults are affirming and shared in the community, and the extent to which relationships, communication patterns, and other dynamics of school culture actualize these beliefs and expectations in practice . Lipman (1998) found in her investigation of school reform efforts aimed at improving the academic achievement of African-American students, that educators ended up reproducing the underachievement and denial of cultural citizenship to African-American students that the reform was undertaken to ameliorate. It was educators' failure to address the difficult issues of race, class, equity, personal responsibility and interconnectedness, Lipman reports, that led to the same outcomes after restructuring as before. People shied away from a deep engagement with beliefs, values, differences and commonalities.

This brings us to a larger consideration of the anthropology of policy. I believe that the continuing conflict about bilingual education and English Immersion indicate the need to be more diligent in interrogating what is at stake and for whom in policy questions both at a "macro" and at a "micro" level. We need to be more explicit about what criteria will constitute successful policy implementation. And *all* stakeholders, all community members must be included in these dialogues. As Rosaldo (1994) and Shore and Wright (1997) remind us, we must be aware of and sensitive to whose voice is (and isn't) included in conversations about who "we" are (who has a stake in policy decisions and outcomes), where we want to go (what are the goals of a policy, academic, material and cultural; what meanings to people imbue to policies and how do they express them?) and how we are going to get there (what are the explicit requirements of a policy? What room within the mandate is there for tailoring the policy to local contingencies? What kind of data will we use to measure success or failure, and how will it be accorded credibility?).

In other words, ethnographies of policy can be key vessels through which to explore dynamics of cultural citizenship: Like Bourdieu and Passeron (1977) say about language, one cannot talk about policy without also talking about sets of relations to that policy. Policies can be "cultural artifacts" (Rosaldo 1994) that we study to understand

and raise questions about the "collective fictions" policymakers and implementers tell them(our)selves about experiences and outcomes within structures of local and national participation. Ethnographies of policy could help make community members, policymakers and educational practitioners more effective "applied language planners" (Corson 1999)-- and I would add, better "cultural citizenship planners." For example, at South Central Elementary we see that people did not embrace or bristle against a particular language policy in and of itself. They championed or challenged a policy according to which relational context they considered it within, using it to voice and operationalize agendas towards a better "place to stand" (hooks 2000) in the community both local and national. Bringing more thorough, critical understandings of policy expectations and mandates from without, policy hopes and agendas within, and the practical dictates of daily life and experiences of implementation in school communities could facilitate collaborative consideration of the question, "How are we going to do what we hope to do" with public education (6)? This is an important question, as the nation continues to wrestle with a frenzy of education policy reform. Every school board, politician and pundit seems to have a program or a test, some magic bullet that can get parents, administrators, teachers and students to raise achievement and narrow achievement gaps. And as I have pointed out, many see Proposition 227 as but an extension of or a particular manifestation of more encompassing political efforts to counter other social movements such as those for immigrants' rights, affirmative-action and civil rights.

Here is where I believe current-day anthropology of policy can intersect in a very important way with the anthropology of race, language and politics in the 21st century. The arena of education is where what the socially legitimate means and ends of a community and a society are to be, and whose knowledge is of most worth (McCarthy and Crichlow 1993) are negotiated writ large. Public schools themselves are traditionally places where people are brought together across the range of their differences, and this range seems to complexify and wrap in upon itself more and more all the time. I believe that as communities small, large and global become more diverse across multiple axes of

experience (e.g. race, language, culture, nationality, class), ethnographies about race, language, immigration, etc. should be conceptualized less as ethnographies of these in and of themselves and more as ethnographies of cultural citizenship--of how communities define themselves, their interests and purpose, their binding solidarities, their boundaries, the benefits of and criteria for membership, and their voice/s (Flores and Benmayor 1997). For example as we saw in this dissertation, while race proved to be an enduring, powerful category of experience that animated political life, it also proved to be much more than "just race." As the principal so aptly put it, at South Central race *is* language. (As Delpit and Kilgour Dowdy (2002) say, we speak our skin.) And while language seemed to be the key issue at hand (Spanish or English? For whom?), it was both locally and in the media inseparable from assumptions about race and the meaning of immigration within the boundaries of the nation. I started out my research in 1996 assuming that I was researching how race, language and nation each informed struggles over bilingual education policy. I came to understand that my work is more an exploration of struggles for cultural citizenship, and that bilingual education policy is a key artifact through which to examine how dynamics of race, language, immigration, nation and material struggle *co-construct each other within* the politics of community. My main realization here has been the deep nature of *connections* between the pragmatics of race, language and nation/immigration. These categories of experience needed to be understood in relation to each other in order to understand large-scale policy agendas, and socio-political dynamics on campus and the educational environment this shaped. Ellsworth's (1997) point comes to mind here, that race should be understood less as a static given and more as a complex set of practices, forms of property, performances; as shifting locations of privilege and subordination; as polyvocal, political symbols. I came to see that categories of experience that are so politically charged these days like language, immigrant status, and nation-ness ("America," "Amexica") should also be explored as such. I think this will give us richer understandings of how interpretive communities, political agendas, social movements, etc. form and play out.

The utilization of multisited ethnography and discourse analysis methodologies in

the service of studies of cultural citizenship can make anthropology more relevant to the field of education. Scholars of cultural citizenship can consider the range of these differences as well as commonalities through our data, analyses, critiques and questions about how people everywhere struggle to achieve that status of "being a part of" (in the words of one teacher at South Central Elementary), and about how educators strive to provide excellent, equitable education in high-performing, inclusive, diverse public schools. And this is evermore important as educators strive to do this under increasingly high-stakes accountability programs and policy mandate pressures. Regarding discourse analysis in a very basic sense, as the vice principal at South Central Elementary recognized in 1996, the "she said, she said" conversation can be very powerful on a school campus. On the detrimental side (as she had feared, trying to block my return to the school community) researching and engaging people around how we talk about each other, our conflicts and hopes can become destructive vortexes of gossip. On the productive side (as I aimed for with the PDG's) collaboratively interrogating the ways we talk about our lives in schools can give us direct entrée to each other's experiences and to the building blocks for coalitional voices about experiences, conflicts and hopes (more "we said"'s). As I found during this research, it was a multiplicity of differences, commonalities, context, pressures and opportunities that informed the way people lived with one another on campus, and the educational environment they then shaped for children. And as Lipman (1998), Lein et al. (1996), Hilliard (1991) and Horton (1995) (amongst others) have found, the outcomes of any educational policy, reform or agenda are best understood and most productively shaped for all when the issues of the heart and the human side of change (Evans 1996) are addressed--when the processes of how people ask and answer basic questions of "who are *we*, where are *we* going and how will *we* get there together?" are examined. Regarding multisited ethnography, as I found it necessary to consider the national as well as local contexts within which people moved in order to understand their opinions and agendas, and as teachers work closely with local minutia and grand social mandates, analysis of discourse in schools should also incorporate the examination of texts and meanings in policy and politics and media--which leads me to

the last answer to the question, "So what?"

Reflecting on the activist components to my project I think that what was important was that I began this journey of molding inquiry with practice, of reflexivity as method. Just as we see with all meaningful, paradigmatic school change, it takes time. Though I have now been involved in the local school community on and off for 11 years (and researching that the media "site" on and off for 8), this has indeed been just the beginning. The the Professional Discussion Groups did not fully take off, I think it was destiny that the job I found in 2000 (I needed a work schedule that allowed time for writing this dissertation --which Third Grade Teacher did not allow!) was a position with a non-profit organization that engages me with schools in Los Angeles as a coach-consultant. As I have said, as a coach-consultant I facilitate the work of school leadership teams as they work through processes of inquiry (self-analysis utilizing data about the school both qualitative and quantitative), reflection, planning and action. Most basically, this position is one of activist: My major goal as coach-consultant is to have these processes result in higher achievement and the closing of achievement gaps for all students and in full participation for all adult school community members. This past school year I conducted some case studies for the nonprofit organization, looking at how this work was experienced by the participating school leadership team members themselves. I was amazed at how positively they valued the time for analysis, reflection and communication. So many expressed what I felt when I left teaching in 1994 to begin my study of the anthropology of education-- that looking at ourselves actively and critically is the only way in which will understand how *how and why* we do things affects *what* we do; and that research and activism conducted by people *on campus* is key to making a healthy school community. It is these people, after all, who have to make the process and the data *useful*. Along the lines of Freire's idea of contientização (Shor 1987), then, the basic ideals of multicultural education (that school community members engage the range of differences and commonalities amongst stakeholders in order to address issues of power, privilege and achievement) can be powerfully served when a kind of *pedagogy of cultural citizenship* is enlivened. And I think this can flow over into

and connect with other, larger civil rights, anti-colonialist and other movements that seek equity in quality of life for all people. This could encompass a multiplicity of activist ethnographic projects that interrogate both how and why *claims to* cultural citizenship (agency; "self-making" as discussed by Flores and Benmayor [1997]) take the forms that they do, and how the limited and exclusionary *entryways to* cultural citizenship are determined by the dominant (structures; "subject-ificatioin" in the Foucaldian sense, as discussed by Ong [1996]) and how they function in diverse school communities. Anthropologists and community members will then be well-paced to decide how all these dynamics can be engaged with to achieve more inclusive processes and outcomes of cultural citizenship (and excellent educations) for all.

For social scientists interested in activism and who have varying possibilities for practical involvement in the field (they cannot quit jobs in academia to teach at an elementary school, for example) I would pose the question, what is "activism?" The questions of balance between practice and change projects, and of the structure of activist projects that I pondered above makes me wonder if true "activist" work can be done in the short term. It takes more time than I had, I think, to find the right balance and *the right structure and flow for work* that will work within and affect positive change in a particular community.

I do not have an answer I'm comfortable with yet to this question, what is "activism?", but I think that it connects to the question that Nayaran asked in 1993: How insider is insider, how native is native? At the moment I think it is important to just ask it, and to express the complete conviction I have that to make research meaningful outside the ivory tower, social scientists need to be more involved in schools (and more broadly, in other politically important sites in society. Postcolonial, post-positivist movements have already made it a widely excepted "fact" in the social sciences that ethnography is a subjective endeavor and that researchers affect the research site, de facto. Why not just be more explicit and proactive about this?). These are heady times of change. It is not just South Central Elementary wondering "Who are we, anymore?" or just "America" morphing into "Amexica." Communities and nations across the globe

are negotiating change and struggles for cultural citizenship now as ever before. And in the field of education, at least, we are increasingly accountable for proving results backed up with data. Anthropologists can become real, active participants in school communities and in movements for cultural citizenship if they dig in for the long haul to facilitate the provision and training in processes of inquiry, data collection, data analysis, and the use of these with *all* community members, to make communities stronger, to make policies and reforms work for people. It will be the people in school communities and in social movements along with anthropologists who will decide how "inside" one needs to be to be "native," how "native" one needs to be to be effective; and how “different” or “new” projects have to be from what is already going on in the community to be “activist.”

Now what?

My next steps are two, at least:

One is to address the dilemma of translation (Jacobs-Huey 2002) that I find being a teacher *and* anthropologist. Turning this dissertation into an academic article or book will be a whole different "thing" than making it into sets of practitioner-oriented resources. Sharing my emerging knowledge and perspectives about cultural citizenship, bilingual education policy, race, language, nation, immigration, activism, and multisited ethnography of education will be the most traditional next step for a new Ph.D. It will surely be a challenge but one that my graduate education has prepared me for. On the other hand, morphing my findings into something useful for practitioners will be a step into less-charted waters, though my experience as a teacher, credential program instructor and coach-consultant will be steppingstones. While I am not yet sure of the forms these practitioner-oriented resources might take, I hope they will support efforts to make school communities stronger in diversity. I hope they contribute to agendas and action steps towards the realization of "a national policy on language" as articulated by Smitherman's (2002: 170-174) : a) "Reinforce the need for and teaching of the language of wider communication" (i.e. give all access to the national/global valued competence and linguistic capital); b) "Reinforce and reaffirm the legitimacy of non-mainstream languages and dialects and promote mother tongue instruction as a co-equal language of

instruction along with the language of wider communication" (i.e. build language and consciousness and political "bridges" between mainstream and non-mainstream competencies--this could be bilingual, bi-cultural education *and it could encompass a pedagogy of cultural citizenship*); and c) "Promote the acquisition of one or more foreign languages, preferably a language spoken by persons in the Third World, such as Spanish, because of its widespread use in this hemisphere" (again, this could be bilingual, bi-cultural education *and it could encompass a pedagogy of cultural citizenship*).

I think my chief connection here is identifying these goals for language policy with those for a pedagogy of cultural citizenship, which would include addressing dynamics of language, race, nation/immigration, class, and other pertinent categories of experience and axes of similarity/difference/participation/exclusion/power. This, in order to contribute to efforts as articulated by Hakuta (2001:10): "What is critical is finding and communicating a set of program components [and norms of cultural citizenship] that work for children in a given community of interest, within the context of the goals, demographics, and resources of the community," and according to the non-negotiable goal of bringing equitable and excellent education to *all* students

Two, I need to forge my long-term practitioner-ethnographer-activist identity. Will this identity be fulfilled through further work with South Central Elementary? Will it be fulfilled through my current work as coach-consultant? Will it extend to work at a university? Exactly what shape it will take I am not sure, but what I will remain faithful to is one of the main lessons I have taken from this dissertation process: that multiple perspectives and sites and time frames and levels of involvement that I employed were all vital *together* to my growing understandings of "Who are *we* and what does this mean?" -- the complex in service of the simple, diversity in service of unity.

APPENDIX

A brief history of bilingual education in the U.S.

Current struggles over bilingual education in the US must be seen in the light of a long history of multilingualism in American schools. From the era of colonization through the late 1800's, schools where English was not the only or even the primary language of instruction were fairly common (Keller and VanHooft 1982:3, Wrigley 1982: 55). However, while non-English and bilingual schools continued to exist up through World War One they did so precariously. Most were controversial and short-lived (Keller and VanHooft 1982: 3, Estrada 1979).

One of the major forces behind anti-bilingual education in the US has been nativism. Nativism has been defined as, “every type and level of antipathy toward [newcomers], their institutions, and their ideas”(Higham 1994:3), and as “intense opposition to an internal minority on the ground of its foreign (i.e., ‘un-American’)” practices or connections(4). Nativism has surfaced throughout American history in the forms of anti-Catholicism, anti-socialist and anti-communist “fear of foreign radicals,” and, most often, anti-immigrationism (Higham 1994: 6,7). Nativist sentiments have been invoked by intense economic competition, new immigrants suffering all manner of discrimination and mistreatment on the part of groups who have been here longer (often, not much longer). Nativist movements have also been informed by racism, resulting in popular conceptions even through today, of "true Americans" as white Anglo-Saxons, and all others as Other (Almaguer 1994; Takaki 1990).

The first legislative action taken to restrict immigration was the Immigration Act of 1882, enacted in response to outcries by the upper and middle classes over high levels of immigration that resulted, they argued, in "throngs" of unemployed “aliens” that were a burden to society (Higham 1994: 51, 68,70). Due to the increasing influence of Darwinism and eugenics, by the early 1900's Anglo-Saxon society was gripped by a widespread fear of the "unruly," "darker" Southern and Eastern European immigrants,

and by a hysteria over the coming "Yellow Peril" brought by Asian newcomers (Higham 1995; also Alamaguer 1994; Roediger 1991; Takaki 1990).

World War One brought a new suspicion of languages other than English in school. Why encourage anti-American feeling by encouraging the use of German in schools?, many asked. Why encourage the "hyphenated American" phenomena, the immigrant with divided loyalty (Higham 1994: 197-198)? Herein lies much of the reasoning behind nativist feeling today, the equation of "loyalty" to the nation with conformity to the monolingual, English-speaking, Anglo-Saxon "norm." Schools came to be seen as a primary vehicle for assimilation and Americanization, producing the almost complete abandonment of bilingual education. English-Only instructional mandates spread throughout the country, with thirty four states adopting English-Only laws by 1923 (Keller and VanHooft 1982:7).

The experiences of American soldiers in World War Two had quite a different impact on attitudes towards language diversity in school. In Europe, soldiers were exposed to life where linguistic pluralism was the norm. Many were confounded by their inability to communicate with their allies due to their own monolingualism. More, upon return from Europe, "minority group veterans were [re-sensitized] to the [racial] injustices of American society and to their position as second-class citizens" (Keller and VanHooft 1982: 9). This lead to widespread efforts to increase literacy and foreign language instruction as well as to reinvigorate bilingual education. By the 1960's bilingual programs had begun to appear again in public schools.

Social movements of the 1960's, championing the rights of racial and ethnic groups and women, and demanding a national ideological commitment to equality of opportunity, made the moment ripe for federal support of bilingual education. The Johnson administration's 1965 Elementary and Secondary Education Act was an effort to target federal money to pockets of chronic poverty in urban centers and the Southwest. Then, in response to the "dramatic increase of Spanish-speaking constituents" as evidenced in the 1960 census (Matute-Bianchi 1979:22), and to pressure from activist Chicano/Latino communities for culturally and linguistically appropriate education, the

Johnson Administration enacted the Bilingual Education Act of 1968 as Title VII of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (Matute-Bianchi 1979:18).

The struggles of Chicano/Latino communities for bilingual education has been part of what many argue is a kind of de-colonization struggle. The relationship of the U.S. to many Mexican-American communities smacks of neo-colonialism, from the 1848 war with Mexico and the wresting of approximately half of Mexico's territory by the US (Barrera, M. 1997: 41), to the often violent imposition of English on Spanish speakers in the Southwest, to the still gaping inequalities in socio-economic and education levels between Mexican-Americans and Anglos, that can be seen to have been implicitly endorsed by the government and larger society (Trujillo 1996: 120).

In the 1973 supreme court case, Lau v. Nichols, a group of Chinese-American parents in San Francisco filed a class action suit against the school district, charging that because their children did not speak English they were not receiving appropriate for equal access to the all-English curriculum (Applewhite 1979:7). The court mandated that San Francisco schools implement Chinese-, Filipino-, and Spanish-English bilingual programs. The goal was to level the playing field between mainstream English speaking children and English learners (Matute-Bianchi 1979:16). This decision became the basis for bilingual programs across the nation.

Legislation has always left the door open for debate about the terms and goals of such programs (Keller and VanHooft 1982:19). While Trujillo notes that the long-range aim of all bilingual programs has "always been [that] of harmonious integration" (1996:122), the Bilingual Education Act did not outline a clear goal (transition or maintenance or both) for bilingual programs (19). This early legislation "did not specifically exclude maintenance programs," where the English learners' first language literacy skills would continue to be developed after the transition to English (16). As such, Casanova (1991) notes that pre-1980 debates about bilingualism addressed the value of maintaining biliteracy versus using the native language as a transitional tool in the teaching of English. However a shift occurred in the politics of bilingual education in the 1990s.

By the 1990s immigration was once again a major national issue, as we will see in the following chapters on media discourses. Large numbers of immigrants arrived from Latin America, Asia and Africa, changing demographics in communities large and small. This time period saw the revival of a virulent nativist ideology. Legislative restrictions on immigration and welfare were enacted. A slew of state measures to make English the official language of state business appeared (by 1996 twenty-three states including California had Official English laws [Savage 1996:A1]). Bilingual education became a rallying point for this nativist revival, and Latinos the condensed, racialized symbol of the myriad "troubles" portrayed as “caused” by “aliens."

Under the growing threat of total loss of support for bilingual education, the possibility of maintenance bilingual programs lost clout in debates. Activists and pundits now argued the merits of structured English immersion (basically, “sink or swim") versus transitional bilingual instruction. Ironically, Casanova comments, this shift in the parameters of the debates about language/s in school occurred while the research evidence supporting the advantages of lifelong bilingualism and of bilingual instruction “continue[d] to mount” (1991:173-174).

This movement to outlaw bilingual education became what many saw us but one prong in a multi-pronged attack on pluralism, immigration and civil rights. Another prong was California's ballot measure Proposition 187, which captured national attention in 1994. Passed with nearly 60% of the vote, Prop 187 sought to severely limit an array of social services to "illegal aliens." Most contentious was its move to deny public education to "illegals." Proponents of 187 argued that the streams of "uninvited" newcomers--most of them indigent Mexicans with huge families, they said --did not deserve an education at American taxpayers' expense; we're trying to save the best of America "for Americans"; "Americans" should not have to pay for "their" education, it's not fair. Opponents of the proposition retorted that everyone within United States' borders deserved equal access to education; America is a land of immigrants and Prop 187 is a nativist, racist, anti-Latino manifesto. Immigrants invigorated the economy, they argued, and revitalized the American Dream (Velasquez 1995, Colvin 1996). Prop 187

sat in courts of appeal from 1994 until 1999 when Governor Gray Davis maneuvered the measure to its legislative death amongst revived debates over immigrants' rights, responsibilities and place within the nation (Lesher and Morain 1999, Lesher1999, Ramos 1999, Cooper 1999). Though 187 died its spirit was upheld in that the Proposition's other major proposed restrictions on social services for "illegal" immigrants were in force anyway as part of 1996 federal immigration reform.

California's Proposition 209 was seen as yet another prong. Passed in 1996, it ended Affirmative Action programs in the state's higher education system (Egelko 1999). Echoing debates about Proposition 187, Proposition 209 was often characterized by its proponents as reviving the spirit of American educational opportunity by outlawing the use of the "arbitrary" category of race in admissions decisions. To the contrary its opponents pinned it as a white, racist, conservative backlash against demographic shifts and the economic and social gains made by Latinos and African-Americans in recent decades. This California measure had widespread implications because it bolstered anti-Affirmative Action efforts nationwide. It has become one of a string of efforts to dismantle social changes won by the Civil Rights movement (for example the September, 1999 news of a North Carolina school district terminating desegregation busing programs [Coleman 1999] up through President Bush's supporting (and almost celebrating a victory in) the case in Michigan to outlaw race as a determining factor in public university admissions).

Propositions 187 and 209 are discussed further into the media chapters, in relation to Proposition 227, California's 1998 "English For The Children" anti-bilingual education ballot measure.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Abu-Lughod, Lila
1991 Writing Against Culture. *In* Recapturing Anthropology: Working in the Present. Richard G. Fox, ed. Santa Fe: School of American Research Press, pp. 137-162.

Agar, Michael H.
1996 The Professional Stranger: An Informal Introduction to Ethnography. San Diego: Academic Press.

Alba, Richard D.
1990 Ethnic Identity: The Transformation of White America. New Haven: Yale University Press.

All Things Considered
2000a Radio show on KCRW, 89.9 FM, March 13, 6:00 PM.
2000b Radio show on KCRW, 89.9 FM, Dec. 13, 5:40 PM.

Almaguer, Tomás
1994 Racial Fault Lines: The Historical Origins of White Supremacy in California. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.

Althusser, Louise
1971 Lennon and Philosophy and Other Essays. New York: Monthly Review Press.

Alvarez-Cáccamo, Celso
1996 Building Alliances in Political Discourse: Language, Institutional Authority and Resistance. Folia Linguistica 30:3/4.

Amador, Lucero
2000 Manifestación fronteriza. La Opinión. July 22: 1B, 2B.

Anderson, Benedict
1983 Imagined Communities. London: Verso.

Anderson, Kimberly S.
1997 What should the "Bilingual" in bilingual education mean?: Race, Language and Nation in Debates About Bilingual Education in the United States. Masters Thesis, Department of Anthropology, The University of Texas at Austin.

Anderson, Nick and Louis Sahagun
1998 Bilingual Classes Still Thriving in Wake of Prop 227. Los Angeles Times October, 22, pp. A1, A32.

Antrop-González, René
2002 Watch What You Read: Not All Policies or Newspaper Articles Are Research-Based. NABE News 25(5): 14-19.

Anzaldúa, Gloria
1987 Borderlands/La Frontera: The New Mestiza. San Fransisco: Aunt Lute Books.

Appadurai, Arjun
1991 Global Ethnoscapes: Notes and Queries for a Transnational Anthropology. *In* Recapturing Anthropology. Richard G. Fox, ed. Pp.191-210. Santa Fe: School of American Research Press.
Apple, Michael
1993 Constructing the 'Other': Rightist Reconstructions of Common Sense. *In* Race, Identity and Representation in Education. McCarthy and Crichlow, eds. Pp. 24-39. New York: Routledge.
1996 Cultural Politics and Education. New York: Teachers College Press.
1997 Consuming the Other: Whiteness, Education, and Cheap French Fries. *In* Off White: Readings on Race, Power, and Society. Fine et al. eds. Pp. 121-128. New York: Routledge.
Applewhite, Steven R.
1979 The Legal Dialect of Bilingual Education. *In* Ethnoperspectives in Bilingual Education Research: Bilingual Education and Public Policy in the United States. Raymond Padilla, ed. Pp. 3-17. Ypsilanti: Eastern Michigan University.
Applied Research Center
1999 Advertisement. New York Times, February 24: A 19.
Arteaga, Alfred
1996 An Other Tongue: Nation and Ethnicity in the Linguistic Borderlands. Durham: Duke University Press.
Astroff, Roberta J.
1988-89 Spanish Gold: Stereotypes, Ideology, and the Construction of a US Latino Market. Howard Journal of Communications, Winter: 155-173.
Attinasi, John
1997 Racism, Language Variety, and Urban Minorities: Issues in Bilingualism and Bidialectalism. *In* Latinos and Education: A Critical Reader. Antonia Darder, Rodolfo Torres and Henry Gutiérrez, eds. Pp. 279-301. New York: Routledge.
Atweh, Bill, Stephen Kemmis and Mervyn Wilkinson
1998 Participatory Action Research and the Study of Practice. *In* Action Research in Practice: Partnerships for Social Justice in Education. Stephen Kemmis, Bill Atweh and Patricia Weeks, eds. Pp. 21-36. London: Routledge.
Aubrey, Erin
2000 Held Back: The Miserable State of Black Education. L.A. Weekly, January 21-27: 26-32.
August, Diane and Kenji Hakuta, eds.
1997 Improving Schools for Language-Minority Children: A Research Agenda. Washington, DC: National Academy Press.
August, Diane and L. Pease-Alvarez
1996 Attributes of Effective Programs and Classrooms Serving English Language Learners. National Center for Research on Cultural Diversity and Second Language Learning, Center of Applied Linguistics. National Center for Research on Cultural Diversity and Second Language Learning.

Baker, Colin
1993 Foundations of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, Bilingual Matters. Philadelphia: Multilingual Matters, Ltd.
Bakhtin, Mikhail
1991 The Dialogic Imagination. (Caryl Emerson and Michael Holquist, Trans.). Austin: University of Texas Press.
Balibar, Etienne
1991 Is There a 'Neo-Racism'? *In* Race, Nation, Class: Ambiguous Identities. E. Balibar and E. Wallerstein, eds. Pp. 17-28; 217-227. London: Verso.
Ballesteros-Coronel, Mary
2000 Persiste segregación escolar. La Opinión, May 17: 3A, 4A.
Balotta, Alejandro
2000 Esperan a mas latinos en la Legislatura. La Opinión, February 9: 1A, 10A.
Banks, James
1993 Multicultural Education: Development, Dimensions and Challenges. Phi Delta Kappan 75:22-28.
Barrera, Mario
1997 A Theory of Racial Inequality. *In* Latinos and Education: A Critical Reader. Antonia Darder, Rodolfo Torres and Henry Gutiérrez, eds. Pp. 3-44. New York: Routledge.
Barrera, Vivian
2002 Two States Turn to California for Support on Election Day 2002. CABE Multilingual News 26(4): 1.
Baugh, John
1984 Language in Use: Readings in Sociolinguistics. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
Behar, Ruth
1993 Translated Woman: Crossing the Border with Esperanza's Story. Boston: Beacon Press.
1996 The Vulnerable Observer: Anthropology that Breaks Your Heart. Boston: Beacon Press.
Bell, Derek A.
1997a Thank You, Doctors Murray and Herrnstein (Or, Who's Afraid of Critical Race Theory?). *In* Critical White Studies: Looking Behind the Mirror. Richard Delgado and Jean Stefancic, eds. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, pp. 534-537.
1997b White Superiority in America: It's Legal Legacy, Its Economic Costs. *In* Critical White Studies: Looking Behind the Mirror. Richard Delgado and Jean Stefancic, eds. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, Pp. 596-600.
Benmayor, Rina
1991 Testimony, Action Research, and Empowerment: Puerto Rican Women and Popular Education. *In* Women's Words. D. Patai and S. Berger Gluck, eds. Pp. 159-174. New York: Routledge.

Bennet, Adrian T.
1991 Discourses of Power, the Dialectics of Understanding, the Power of Literacy. *In* Rewriting Literacy: Culture and the Discourse of the Other. Candace Mitchell and Kathleen Weiler, eds. Pp. 13-34. New York: Bergin and Garvey.
Berke, Richard
2000 In Debate, Gore and Bradley Tangle on Racial Profiling. The New York Times. January 18, P A1, A18.
Bernard, H. Russell
1993 Research Methods in Anthropology: Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.
Bernstein, Basil
1972 [1970] Social Class, Language and Socialization. *In* Language and Social Context. Paolo Giglioli, ed. Pp. 157-178. New York: Penguin Books.
Besnier, Niko
1992 Recorded Speech and Affect on Nukulaelae Atoll. *In* Responsibility and Evidence in Oral Discourse. Jane H. Hill and Judith T. Irvine, eds. Pp. 161-181. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Bhabba, Homi
1994 Locations of Culture. New York: Routledge.
Bianco, Joseph Lo
2003 Globalisation and Language: An Explosion of Policy for Second Language Learners. NABE News, May/June: 13-14.
Blankstein, Andrew and Michael Luo
1999 Principal Badly Beaten in Alleged Hate Crime. Los Angeles Times, February 3: B1, B8.
Blount, Ben G., ed.
1995 Language, Culture, and Society: A Book of Readings. Prospect Heights, Illinois: Waveland Press.
Blume, Howard
2002 Dueling for an Education: Some Parents Win, Others Lose English-Spanish Program. L.A. Weekly, May 3-9: 18-20.
Blume, Howard and Ben Ehrenreich
1998 Squeeze Play (English, Español. The Failure of Bilingual Education and the Proposition That Would Make Things Worse). LA Weekly May 29-June 4, pp.18-25.
Bourdieu, Pierre
1991 Language and Symbolic Power. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
Bourdieu, Pierre and Jean-Claude Passeron
1977 Reproduction in Education, Society and Culture. London: Sage Publications.
Bourgois, Phellipe
1995 In Search of Respect. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bowles, Samuel and Herbert Gintis
1976 Schooling In Capitalist America: Educational Reform and the Contradictions of Economic Life. New York: Basic Books.
Breslau, Karen
2000 Hable Ingles, Por Favor. Newsweek, March 12: 64.
Buckley, William F.
2000 Let the People Vote on the Confederate Flag. January 19, P. B7.
Butler, Judith
1996 Speech at the University of Texas at Austin. September 11.
Bullough, Robert V., Jr. and Andrew Gitlin
1995 Becoming A Student of Teaching: Methodologies for Exploring Self and School Context. New York: Garland Publishing, Inc.
Cabrera, Dan
1996 Bilingual Education Segregates Children to Their Disadvantage. Los Angeles Times, May 12: E4.
California Department of Education
2000 1999 Academic Performance Index (API) School Report: Summary for Grades 2-8. www.LAUSD.k12.ca.us
Carspecken, Phil Francis and Michael Apple
1992 Critical Qualitative Research: Theory, Methodology, and Practice. *In* The Handbook of Qualitative Research in Education. Margaret de LeCompte, Wendy L. Millroy, and Judith Preissle, eds. Pp. 507-553. New York: Academic Press.
Casanova, Ursula
1991 Bilingual Education: Politics or Pedagogy? *In* Bilingual Education Focusschrift in Honor of Joshua Fishman. Ofelia García, ed. Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
Cazden, Courtney B. and David K. Dickinson
1981 Language in Education: Standardization vs. Cultural Pluralism. *In* Language in the USA. Charles A. Ferguson and Shirley Brice Heath, eds. Pp. 446-468. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Chavez, Linda
1994 Bilingual Education Gobbles Up Kids, Taxes. USA Today, June 15: __.
Cheng, Li-Rong Lilly
1987 Competence of Language Minority Children: Assessment and Treatment of Language 'Impaired' Preschoolers. *In* Success or Failure? Learning and the Language Minority Student. Henry T. Trueba, ed. Cambridge: Newbury House Publishers.
Clough, Michael
1997 Birth of Nations. Los Angeles Times, July 27: M1-M6.
Collard, William
1999 Cut Immigration Now. New York Times, August 7: A18.

Colvin, Richard Lee
1996 Battle Heats Up Over Bilingual Education. Los Angeles Times, April 8: A1.
1999 Ruling Ends Historic Forced Busing Program. Los Angeles Times, September 11: A1, A13.
Cooper, Richard T.
1999 Inquiry Into English-Only Tests Ordered. Los Angeles Times, Sept. 16: A3, A20.
Cooper, Marc
1994 The War Against Illegal Immigrants Heats Up. Village Voice, October 4: 28.
Cordero Guzmán, Héctor R.
1997 The Structure of Inequality and the Status of Puerto Rican Youth in the U.S. *In* Latinos and Education: A Critical Reader. Antonia Darder, Rodolfo Torres and Henry Gutiérrez, eds. Pp. 80-94. New York: Routledge.
Corson, David
1999 Language Policy In Schools: A Resource for Teachers and Administrators. Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Earlbaum Associates.
Cortés, Carlos
1995 Education In A Multicultural Society. Restructuring Brief, 4th Annual Colloquium of the California Staff Development Council.
Crawford, James
1992a Hold Your Toungue: Bilingualism and the Politics of English Only. Addison-Wesley 1992.
1992b Language Loyalties: A Sourcebook on the Official English Controversy. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
1995 [3rd ed.] Bilingual Education: History, Politics, Theory and Practice. Bilingual Educational Services.
1997 Issues in U.S. Language Policy. Electronic document http://ourworld.compuserv.com/homepages/JCRAWFORD/ .
1998 The Bilingual Education Story: Why Can't the News Media Get It Right? Presentation to the National Association of Hispanic Journalists. Miami, June 26. Electronic document http://ourworld.compuserv.com/homepages/JCRAWFORD/.
Crenshaw, Kimberlé, Neil Gotanda, Gary Peller and Kendall Thomas, eds.
1995 Critical Race Theory: The Key Writings that Formed the Movement. New York: The New Press.
Crowley, T.
1989 Standard English and the Politics of Language. Chicago: University of Illinois Press.
Cuadrado, Mary
1993 Throw Away the Crutch of Bilingual Education. New York Times, January 21: A18.

Cummins, Jim
1985 Empowering minority students: A framework for intervention. Harvard Educational Review 56: 18-35.
1991 The Politics of Paranoia: Reflection on the Bilingual Education Debate. *In* Bilingual Education Focusschrift in Honor of Joshua Fishman. Ofelia García, ed. Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
Darder, Antonia
1997 Creating the Conditions for Cultural Democracy in the Classroom. *In* Latinos and Education: A Critical Reader. Antonia Darder, Rodolfo Torres and Henry Gutiérrez, eds. Pp. 331-350. New York: Routledge.
Darder, Antonia, Rodolfo Torres and Henry Gutiérrez, eds.
1997 Latinos and Education: A Critical Reader. New York: Routledge.
Davidson, Ann Locke, and Patricia Phelan, eds.
1993 Renegotiating Cultural Diversity in American Schools. New York: Teachers College Press.
Davis, Mike
1990 City of Quartz: Excavating the Future in Los Angeles. New York: Vintage Books.
de la Cruz, Elena
2000 Tras el fin de la educación bilingüe. La Opinión, April 3: 1A, 12A.
de la Torre-Jimenez, Lilian and Armando E. Botello
1999 Nueva 187 antiinmigrante. La Opinión, November 14: 1A , 8A.
Deadline L.A.
1999 The Media and Education. Radio show on KPFK 90.7 FM. August 1.
deJong, E.
1996 Integrated Education for Language Minority Children. *In* Educating Immigrant Children: Schools and Language Minorities in Twelve Nations. C. Glenn, ed. Pp. 504-574. New York: Garland Publishing.
deLauretis, Teresa
1990 Eccentric Subjects: Feminist Theory and Historical Consciousness. Feminist Studies 16(Spring):1.
Delgado, Richard and Jean Stefancic, eds.
1997 Critical White Studies: Looking Behind the Mirror. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
Delgado-Gaitan, Concha and Henry Trueba
1991 Crossing Cultural Borders: Education for Immigrant Families in America. New York: The Falmer Press.
Delpit, Lisa
1993 The Politics of Teaching Literate Discourse. *In* Freedom's Plow. James Fraser and Theresa Perry, eds. Pp. 285-296. New York: Routledge.
1995 Other People's Children: Cultural Conflict in the Classroom. New York: The New Press.

Delpit, Lisa and Joanne Kilgour Dowdy, eds.
2002 The Skin That We Speak: Thoughts on Language and Culture in the Classroom. New York: The New Press.
deSaussure, Ferdinand
1966 Course in General Linguistics. New York: McGraw-Hill.
DeWalt, Billie R. and Pertti J. Pelto, eds.
1985 Micro and Macro Levels of Analysis in Anthropology: Issues in Theory and Research. Boulder: Westview Press.
Domínguez, Virginia
1997 White By Definition: Social Classification in Creole Louisiana. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press.
Donato, Rubén and Martha Menchaca
1991 Segregation, Desegregations...Problems and Prospects. *In* Chicano School Failure and Success: Research and Policy Agendas for the 1990's. Richard Valencia, ed. Pp. 27-63. New York: The Falmer Press.
Du Bois W. E. B.
[1903] 1990 The Souls of Black Folk: Essays and Sketches. New York: Vintage Books.
1940 Dusk of Dawn: An Essay Toward an Autobiography of a Race Concept. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers.
Duranti, Alessandro
1994 From Grammar to Politics: Linguistic Anthropology in a Western Samoan Village. Berkeley: University of California Press.
Dusheck, Charles
1995 Valley Perspective. Second Opinions: Populace Fluent In English Basic to Economic Survival. Los Angeles Times, December 13: B13.
Ebert, Teresa
1992-93 Ludic Feminism, the Body, Performance, and Labor: Bringing Materialism Back into Feminist Cultural Studies. Cultural Critique, Winter Pp. 5-50.
Egelko, Bob
1999 Suprema Corte decidirá sección de la Prop. 209. La Opinión, September 2: 6B.
Eisenhart, Margaret A. and Kenneth R. Howe
1992 Validity in Educational Research. *In* The Handbook of Qualitative Research in Education. Margaret LeCompte, Wendy L. Millroy, and Judith Priessle, eds. Pp. 643-680. New York: Academic Press.
Ellsworth, Elizabeth
1997 Double Binds of Whiteness. *In* Off White: Readings on Race, Power, and Society. Fine, Weis, Powell, and Wong, eds. Pp. 259-269. New York: Routledge.
Enslin, Elizabeth
1994 Beyond Writing: Feminist Practice and the Limitations of Ethnography. Cultural Anthropology 1(4): 537-568.

Erickson, Frederick
1977 Approaches to Inquiry in School-Community Ethnography. *In* CAE Newsletter, 8(2): 58-69.
Ervin-Tripp, Susan
1976 Sociolinguistics. *In* Advances in the Sociology of Language, Volume I, Basic Concepts, Theories and Problems: Alternative Approaches. Joshua A. Fishman, ed. Pp. 15-91. The Hague: Mouton.
Escobar, Arturo
1995 Encountering Development. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
Estrada, Lawrence J.
1979 A Chronicle of the Political, Legislative and Judicial Advance for Bilingual Education and the American Southwest. *In* Ethnoperspectives in Bilingual Education Research: Bilingual Education and Public Policy in the United States. Raymond Padilla, ed. Pp. 97-108. Ypsilanti: Eastern Michigan University Press.
Evans, Robert
1996 The Human Side of School Change: Reform, Resistance, and the Real-life Problems of Innovation. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
Fals-Borda, Orlando
1979 Investigating Reality in Order to Transform It: The Colombian Experience. Dialectical Anthropology, 4: (March) 33-55.
Fals-Borda, Orlando, and Mohammad Anisur Rahman, eds.
1991 Action and Knowledge: Breaking the Monopoly with Participatory Action-Research. New York: The Apex Press.
Fanon, Frantz
1967 Black Skin White Masks. New York: Grove Press.
Farber, Kathleen S.
1996 Teaching about Diversity through Reflexivity: Sites of Uncertainty, Risk, and Possibility. *In* Practicing What We Teach: Confronting Diversity in Teacher Education. Rene J. Martin, ed. Pp. 49-64. Albany: State University of New York Press.
Fears, Darryl and Antonio Olivo
1999 Results Suggest Race Card's Power in Elections Is Fading. Los Angeles Times, April 15: A1, A31.
Ferguson, Charles A. and Shirley Brice Heath, eds.
1981 Language in the USA. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Fillmore, Lily Wong
1992 Against Our Best Interest: the Attempt to Sabotage Bilingual Education. *In* Language Loyalties: A Sourcebook on the Official English Controversy. James Crawford, ed. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, pp. 367-375.
Fine, Michelle
1997 Witnessing Whiteness. *In* Off White: Readings on Race, Power, and Society. Michelle Fine, Lois Weis, Linda C. Powell and L. Mun Wong, eds. Pp. 57-65. New York: Routledge.

Fine, Michelle, Lois Weis, Judi Addelston, and Julia Marusza
1997 White Loss. *In* Beyond Black and White: New Faces and Voices in U.S. Schools. Maxine Seller and Lois Weis, eds. Pp. 283-302. Albany: State University of New York Press.
Fine, Michelle, Lois Weis, Linda C. Powell, and L. Mun Wong, eds.
1997 Off White: Readings on Race, Power, and Society. New York: Routledge.
Fishman, Joshua A.
1972[1969] The Sociology of Language. *In* Language and Social Context. Paolo Giglioli, ed. Pp 45-58. London: Penguin Books.
1976 The Sociology of Language: An Interdisciplinary Social Science Approach to Language in Society. *In* Advances in the Sociology of Language, Volume I, Basic Concepts, Theories and Problems: Alternative Approaches. Joshua A. Fishman, ed. Pp. 217-404. The Hague: Mouton.
Fishman, Joshua A., ed.
1976 Advances in the Sociology of Language, Volume I, Basic Concepts, Theories and Problems: Alternative Approaches. The Hague: Mouton.
Fishman, Joshua and Gary Keller, eds.
1982 Bilingual Education for Hispanic Students in the United States. New York: Teachers College Press.
Flagg, Barbara, J.
1997a The Transparency Phenomenon, Race-Neutral Decisionmaking, and Discriminatory Intent. *In* Critical White Studies: Looking Behind the Mirror. Richard Delgado and Jean Stefancic, eds., Pp. 220-226. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
1997b "Was Blind, But Now I See": White Race Consciousness and the Requirement of Discriminatory Intent. *In* Critical White Studies: Looking Behind the Mirror. Richard Delgado and Jean Stefancic, eds., Pp. 629-631. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
Flores, William V. and Rina Benmayor
1997 Constructing Cultural Citizenship. *In* Latino Cultural Citizenship. William V. Flores and Rina Benmayor, eds. Pp. 1-26. Boston: Beacon Press.

Flores, William V. and Rina Benmayor, eds.
1997 Latino Cultural Citizenship. Boston: Beacon Press.
Foley, Douglas
1990 Learning Capitalist Culture Deep in the Heart of Tejas. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
1995 The Heartland Chronicles. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
1999 The Fox Project: A Reappraisal. Current Anthropology 40(2): 171-191.
Foley, Neil
1997 The White Scourge: Mexicans, Blacks, and Poor Whites in Texas Cotton Culture. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Fordham, Signithia
1996 Blacked Out: Dilemmas of Race, Identity, and Success at Capital High. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
Foucault, Michel
1972 The History of Sexuality. New York: Vintage Press.
1979 Discipline and Punish, The Birth of the Prison. New York: Vintage Books.
Frankenberg, Ruth
1993 White Women, Race Matters: The Social Construction of Whiteness. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
Frankenberg, Ruth, ed.
1997 Displacing Whiteness: Essays in Social and Cultural Racism. Durham: Duke University Press.
Freire, Paulo
1972[1970] Pedagogy of the Oppressed. New York: Herder and Herder.
1973 Education for Critical Consciousness. New York: Continuum.
Fuentes, Carlos
1992 The Mirror the Other. The Nation, March 30: 408-411.
Gal, Susan
1987 Codeswitching and Consciousness in the European Periphery. American Ethnologist 14:637-653.
1989 Language and Political Economy. *In* Annual Review of Anthropology 18(3): 45-67.
1994 Gender in the Post-Socialist Transition: The Abortion Debate in Hungary. East European Politics and Societies 8(2):256-287.
Galbraith, James
1997 English Über Allies. The Nation, September 29: 4-5.
Gallegos, B., ed.
1994 English: Our Official Language? New York: The H.W. Wilson Co.
García, Eugene
1991 Bilingualism, Second Language Acquistion and Education. *In* Chicano School Failure and Success: Research and Policy Agendas for the 1990's. Richard Valencia, ed. New York: The Falmer Press.
García, Ofelia, ed.
1991 Bilingual Education Focusschrift in Honor of Joshua A. Fishman. Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
García-Irigoyen, Leticia
1999 Demandan a arrendatario por discriminación racial. La Opinión, October 2: 1B, 2B.
Gee, James Paul, Sarah Michaels, and Mary Catherine O'Connor
1992 Discourse Analysis. *In* The Handbook of Qualitative Research In Education, Margaret D. LeCompte, Wendy L. Millroy, and Judith Priessle, eds. Pp. 227-291. San Diego: Academic Press.

Gerstenzang, James
2000 Candidates Keeping Schools at Forefront of Campaign Issues. Los Angeles Times, February 6: A3.
Giglioli, Paolo, ed.
1972 Language and Social Context. New York: Penguin Books.
Gilmore, Perry
1991 Gimme Room: School Resistance, Attitude, and Access to Literacy. *In* Rewriting Literacy: Culture and the Discourse of the Other. Candace Mitchell and Kathleen Weiler, eds. Pp. 57-76. New York: Bergin and Garvey.
Gilroy, Paul
1987 There Ain't No Black in the Union Jack: The Cultural Politics of Race and Nation. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
Ginsburg, Faye
1989 Contested Lives: The Abortion Debate in an American Community. Los Angeles: University of California Press.
1993 The Case of Mistaken Identity: Problems in Representing Women on the Right. *In* When they read what we write: The Politics of Ethnography. C.B. Brettell, ed. Pp. 163-176. Westport, Connecticut: Bergin and Garvey.
Girion, Lisa
2000 13 Phone Operators Win Record $709,284 in English-Only Suit. Los Angeles Times, September 20: C1, C4.
Giroux, Henry A.
1991 Literacy, Difference, and the Politics of Border Crossing. *In* Rewriting Literacy: Culture and the Discourse of the Other. Candace Mitchell and Kathleen Weiler, eds. Pp. ix-xvi. New York: Bergin and Garvey.
1992a Resisting Difference: Cultural Studies and the Discourse of Critical Pedagogy. *In* Cultural Studies. Lawrence Grossberg, Cary Nelson and Paula Treichler, eds. Pp. 199-223. New York: Routledge..
1992b Border Crossings: Cultural Workers and the Politics of Education. New York: Routledge.
1993 Living Dangerously: Identity Politics and the New Cultural Racism, Towards a Critical Pedagogy of Representation. Cultural Studies 7:1.
1997 Rewriting the Discourse of Racial Identity: Towards a Pedagogy and Politics of Whiteness. *In* Harvard Educational Review 67(2): 285-320.
Gitlin, Andrew and Russell
1994 Alternative Methodologies and the Research Context. *In* Power and Method: Political Activism and Educational Research, Andrew Gitlin, ed. Pp. 181-202. New York: Routledge.
Gittelsohn, John and Elizabeth Chey
1999 Glitch on Prop 227 Road? The Orange County Register, May 19, pp. 1, 10.
Gladstone, Mark
1999 Davis' Education Bills Head for Full Vote. Los Angeles Times, February 24: A3, A18.

Glaser, Barney G. and Anselm L. Strauss
1967 The Discovery of Grounded Theory: Strategies for Qualitative Research. New York: Aldine de Gruyter.
Glatthorn, Allen A.
1998 Performance Assessment and Standards-Based Curricula: The Achievement Cycle. Larchmont, New York: Eye On Education.
Glazer, Nathan and Daniel Patrick Moynihan
1974[1970] Beyond the Melting Pot: The Negroes, Puerto Ricans, Jews, Italians, and Irish of New York City. Cambridge: MIT Press.
Goffman, Erving
1974 Frame Analysis: An Essay on the Organization of Experience. New York: Harper and Row.
Golab, Jan
1999 The Color of Hate. Los Angeles Magazine. November, P. 28.
Goldberg, David Theo
1996 In/Visibility and Super/Vision on Race, Veils, and Discourses of Resistance. *In* Fanon: A Critical Reader. Louis R. Gordon, T. Denean Sharpley-Whiting and Renee T. White, eds. pp 179-202. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.
Gómez-Peña, Guillermo
1987 Documented/Undocumented. *In* Multicultural Literacy: Opening the American Mind. Rick Simonson and Scott Walker, eds. Pp. 37-44. Saint Paul, MN: Greywolf Press.
Gordon, Edmund T.
1998 Disparate Diasporas: Identity and Politics in an African-Nicaraguan Community. Austin: University of Texas Press.
Gramsci, Antonio
1971 The Prison Notebooks. New York: International Publishers.
Greenhouse, Steven
2000 Coalition Urges Easing of Immigration Laws. New York Times, May 16: A16.
Gregory, Steven and Roger Sanjek
1994 Race. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press.
Grillo, R.D.
1989 Dominant Languages: Language and Hierarchy in Britain and France. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Grober, Frank Jr.
2000 Debate Over Immigration, Los Angeles Times. February 28: B4.
Groves, Martha
2000 Flaws Found in Rankings of Schools. Los Angeles Times, February 16: A3, A21.
2000 Breather Urged for School Reforms. Los Angeles Times, May 30: A3, A21.

Gumperz, John J. and Dell Hymes
1972 Preface. *In* Directions in Sociolinguistics: The Ethnography of Communication. John J. Gumperz and Dell Hymes, eds. Pp. v-viii. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston Inc.
Gumperz, John J.
1982 Discourse Strategies. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Gupta, Akhil and James Ferguson
1998 Discipline and Practice: The Field " as Site, Method, and Location in Anthropology. *In* Anthropological Locations: Boundaries and Grounds of a Field Science. Akhil Gupta and James Ferguson, eds. Pp. 1-46. Berkeley: University of California Press.
Gupta, Akhil and James Ferguson, eds.
1998 Anthropological Locations: Boundaries and Grounds of a Field Science. Berkeley: University of California Press.
Gurza, Agustin
1999 A Language Is a Terrible Thing to Lose. Los Angeles Times, May 18: B1.
Haguchi, Day
1999 Into the Education Age: A Message From the President. United Teachers Los Angeles, 1998-1999 Annual Report: 3.
Hakuta, Kenji
2001 Education of Language Minority Students: Testimony to the United States Commission on Civil Rights, April 13. CABE Multilingual News 24(6): 1-11.
Hale, Charles R.
1994 Between Che Guevara and the Pachamama: Mestizos, Indians and Identity Politics in the Anti-quincentenary Campaign. Critique of Anthropology 14(1): 9-39.
Hale Hankins, Karen
1997 Cacophony to Symphony: Memoirs in Teacher Research. In Harvard Educational Review 68(1): 80-95.
Hall, Stuart
1980 Race, Articulation and Societies Structured in Dominance. *In* Sociological Theories: Race and Colonialism. UNESCO, ed. Paris: UNESCO.
1988 The Toad in the Garden: Thatcherism Among the Theorists. *In* Marxism and the Interpretation of Culture. Nelson and Grossberg, eds. Pp. 35-37. Chicago: University of Illinois Press.
1996 New Ethnicities. *In* Stuart Hall: Critical Dialogues in Cultural Studies. David Morely and Chen Kuan-Hsing, eds. Pp. 441-449. New York: Routledge.
Hamilton, Mary
1998 Reflections from the Field: Histories and Horoscopes: The Ethnographer as Fortune-Teller. Anthropology and Education Quarterly 29(3): 347-356.
Handler, Richard
1988 Nationalism and the Politics of Cutlure in Quebec. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.

Handler, Richard and Jocelyn Linnekin
1984 Tradition, Genuine or Spurious. Journal of American Folklore 97:273-90.
Hanrahan, Mary
1998 Academic Growth Through Action Research: A Doctoral Student's Narrative. *In* Action Research in Practice. Stephen Kemmis Atweh and Patricia Weeks, eds. Pp. 302-326.
Haraway, Donna
1988 Situated Knowledges: The Science Question in Feminism and the Privilege of Partial Perspective. Feminist Studies 14:3.
Harris, Cheryl L.
1995 Whiteness as Property. *In* Critical Race Theory: The Key Writings that Formed the Movement. Kimberlé Crenshaw, Neil Gotanda, Gary Peller, and Kendal Thomas, eds. Pp. 276-291. New York: The New Press.
Harrison, Fay V.
1998 Introduction: Expanding the Discourse on "Race." American Anthropologist 100(3): 609-631.
Hartigan, John Jr.
1997 Establishing the Fact of Whiteness. American Anthropologist 99(3): 495-505.
1999 Racial Situations: Class Predicaments of Whiteness in Detroit. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
Hastings, Maribel
2000 Riley solicita más escuelas bilingües. La Opinión, March 16: B6.
2000 Educación de hispanos preocupa a Clinton. La Opinión, June 16: 1A, 12A.
Hauser, Mary E.
1994 Working With School Staff: "Reflective Cultural Analysis" in Groups. *In* Pathways to Cultural Awareness: Cultural Therapy with Teachers and Students. George and Louise Spindler, eds. Pp.169-196. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.
Hayden, Tom
1999 We're a City in Denial About Race. Los Angeles Times, October 19: B9.
Hayes-Bautista, David E.
2000 Latinos Are the New “American Dream Makers.” Los Angeles Times, February 7, P.B5.
Heath, Shirley Brice
1983 Ways With Words: Language, Life, and Work in Communities and Classrooms. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Helfand, Duke
1998 School Board Seeks Waiver for 227. Los Angeles Times, September 25, p. B5.
Helfand, Duke and Louis Sahagun
1999 Principal's Account of Being Attacked Exposes Tensions. Los Angeles Times, February 5: A1, A26.

Heller, Monica
1995 Language Choice, Social Institutions, and Symbolic Domination. Language in Society 24 (3): 373-405.
Henry, Jules
1963 Culture Against Man. New York: Vintage Books.
Heritage Foundation
1994 Immigration or the Welfare State: Which is Our Real Enemy? Fall Policy Review 70:33.
Hicks, Joe
1999 Diversidad y conflicto racial en las escuelas. La Opinión, March 14: B1, B4.
Hidalgo, Nitza
1993 Multicultural Teacher Interest Action. *In* Freedom's Plow. James Frasier and Teresa Perry, eds. Pp. 99-108. New York: Routledge.
Higham, John
1994[1955] Strangers in the Land: Patterns of American Nativism, 1860-1925. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press.
Hill, Jane
1998 Language, Race, and White Public Space. American Anthropologist 100(3):680-689.
Hill, Jane H. and Judith T. Irvine
1992 Introduction. *In* Responsibility and Evidence in Oral Discourse. Jane H. Hill and Judith T. Irvine, eds. Pp. 1-23. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Hill, Jane H. and Judith T. Irvine, eds.
1992 Responsibility and Evidence in Oral Discourse. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Hilliard, Asa III
1991 Do We Have the Will to Educate All Children? Educational Leadership, September, Pp. 31-36.
Hitchcock, Graham and David Hughes
1995[1989] Research and the Teacher: A Qualitative Introduction to School-based Research. New York: Routledge.
Hochschild, Jennifer and Nathan Scovronick
2003 Our Looming 'Racial Generation Gap': The New Demography, the Public Schools, and the American Dream. Education Week, July 9: 39-40, 56.
Hoffman, Diane M.
1998 A Theraputic Moment?: Identity, Self and Culture in the Anthroplogy of Education. *In* Anthropology and Education Quarterly 29(3):324-346.

hooks, bell
1992 Representing Whiteness in the Black Imagination. *In* Cultural Studies. Lawrence Grossberg, Cary Nelson and Paula Treichler, eds. Pp. 338-346. New York: Routledge.
1994a Talking Back: Talking Feminist, Talking Black. Boston: South End Press.
1994b Teaching to Transgress: Education as the Practice of Freedom. New York: Routledge.
2000 Where We Stand: Class Matters. London: Routledge. Horton, John
Horton, John
1995 The Politics of Diversity: Immigration, Resistance, and Change in Monterey Park, California. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
Hochschild, Jennifer and Nathan Scovronick
2003 Our Looming Racial Generation Gap: The New Demography, the Public Schools, and the American Dream. Education Week, July 9, pp. 39, 40, 56.
Hurtado, Aída and Abigail Stewart
1997 Through the Looking Glass: Implications of Studying Whiteness for Feminist Methods. *In* Off White: Readings on Race, Power, and Society. Michelle Fine, Lois Weis, Linda C. Powell, and L. Mun Wong, eds. Pp. 297-311. New York: Routledge.
Hymes, Dell
1972[1964] Toward Ethnographies of Communication: The Analysis of Communicative Events. *In* Language and Social Context. Paolo Giglioli, ed. Pp. 21-44. New York: Penguin Books.
Irvine, Judith T.
1989 When Talk Isn't Cheap: Language and Political Economy. American Ethnologist 16(2): 248-267.
Jacobs-Huey, Lanita
2002 The Natives Are Gazing and Talking Back: Reviewing the Problematics of Positionality, Voice and Accountability Among "Native" Anthropologists. American Anthropologist 104(3): 791-804.
Kagan, Spencer and Michael Kagan
1998 Multiple Intelligences: The Complete MI Book. San Clemente, California: Kagan Cooperative Learning.
Keeler, Carol
1999 'Of 187' Initiative. Los Angeles Times Editorial, November 19: B8.
Keller, Fary D. and Karen S. Van Hooft
1982 A Chronology of Bilingualism and Bilingual Education in the United States. *In* Bilingual Education for Hispanic Students in the United States. Joshua A. Fishman and Gary Keller, eds. Pp. 3-19. New York: Teachers College Press.
Kirby, Stephen
2000 Illegal Aliens and Identity Theft. Los Angeles Times, January 21: B6.
Kondo, Dorinne K.
1990 Crafting Selves. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Kozol, Benjamin
1991 Benjamin's Story. *In* Rewriting Literacy: Culture and the Discourse of the Other. Candace Mitchell and Kathleen Weiler, eds. Pp. 189-196. New York: Bergin and Garvey.
La Opinión News Services
2000a Legislatura de Nebraska propone ley de ayuda para los inmigrantes. La Opinión, March 12: 7A.
2000b Aumenta demanda de personal bilingüe. La Opinión, May 20: 6B.
Labaree, David
1997 Public Goods, Private Goods: The American Struggle Over Educational Goals. American Educational Research Journal 34(1): 39-81.
Labov, William
1972 Language in the Inner City: Studies in Black English Vernacular. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
LaClau, Ernesto and Chantal Mouffe
1984 Hegemony and Socialist Strategy: Towards a Radical Democratic Politics. New York: Verso.
Ladson-Billings, Gloria
1994 The Dream Keepers: Successful Teachers of African American Children. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
1998 Just What Is Critical Race Theory and What's It Doing in a Nice Field Like Education? International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education 11(1): 7-24.
Lasken, Douglas
1995 Two More Reasosn for Breaking Up LA School District. Los Angeles Times, June 18: B19.
1998 Let's make 227 work for all of us. United Teacher XXX (2):14. Los Angeles: United Teachers Los Angeles.
LeCompte, Margaret D., Wendy L. Millroy and Judith Priessle
1992 The Handbook of Qualitative Research In Education. San Diego: Academic Press.
Lee, David
1992 Competing Discourses: Perspective and Ideology in Language. New York: Longman Press.
Lee, Enid
1996 Anti-Racist Education: Pulling Together to Close the Gaps. Addressed to annual METCO conference. Boston, Massachusetts, March**.**
Lein, Laura, Joseph F. Johnson, Jr., Mary Ragland, et.al.
1996 Successful Texas Schoolwide Programs Research Study Results. Austin: The Charles A. Dana Center, the University of Texas at Austin.
Leovy, Jill
1999 Immigrants Protest Reduction of Classes. Los Angeles Times, October 20: B1, B3.

Lesher, Dave
1999 Davis Weighs Dropping Defense of Prop. 187. Los Angeles Times, March 25: A3, A28.
Lesher, Dave and Dan Morain
1999 Davis Asks Court to Mediate on Prop. 187. Los Angeles Times, April 16: A1, A32.
Levine, Mel, Carl Swartz, Martha Reed, Martha Hill, Melissa Wakely, Tamara Nimkoff, Stephanie Lind, and Lisa Marincic
1997 Schools Attuned: Year One Syllabus. An Overview of Neurodevelopmental Function, Dysfunction, and Variation. Chapel Hill, North Carolina: All Kinds Of Minds, The Clinical Center for the Study of Development and Learning.
Levinson, Bradley and Dorothy Holland
1996 Introduction, The Cultural Production of the Educated Person: Critical Ethnographies of Schooling and Local Practice. Pp. 1-54. Albany: State University of New York Press.
Levinson Bradley, Douglas Foley and Dorothy Holland, eds.
1996 The Cultural Production of the Educated Person: Critical Ethnographies of Schooling and Local Practice. Albany: State University of New York Press.
Lewin, Tamar
1998 Public Schools Confronting Issue of Racial Preferences. New York Times, November 29: A1, A34.
Lewis, Anthony
1999 Is This America? New York Times, September 21: A31.
Lewis, Oscar
1966 Anthropological Essays. New York: Random House.
1964 The Children of Sanchez: Autogiography of a Mexican Family. London: Penguin Books.
Linares, Jesse J.
2000 Candidatos a favor de más inmigración. La Opinión, March 2: 1A, 8A.
Linquanti, Robert
2001 The Redesignation Dilemma—A Policy Analysis. Multilingual News, California Association of Bilingual Educators, 25(1,2): 11-13.
Lipman, Pauline
1998 Race, Class and Power in School Restructuring. Albany: State University of New York Press.
Livingston, Carol and Shari Castle, eds.
1989 Teachers and Research in Action. Washington, DC: National Education Association.
Loar, Russ
1995 In Person: Speaking in Favor of Bilingual Education. Los Angeles Times, February 26:B3.

López, Ian F. Haney
1995 The Social Construction of Race. *In* Critical Race Theory: The Cutting Edge. Richard Delgado, ed., pp. 191-203. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
Lopez, Robert J. and Rich Connell
2000 The Class of '89: Journeys Into the New Los Angeles. Los Angeles Times, June 7: A1, S1-S6.
Los Angeles Times [no author listed]
1999 Chasm in the Schools. Los Angeles Times, September 2: B8.
Los Angeles Unified School District
1994-1995 CTBS and APRENDA Test Scores. Information Technology Division.
1995 This Is The Los Angeles Unified School District. Pamphlet. Office of Communications.
1996a School Racial/Ethnic History Information Statistics, Jefferson Cluster. School Information Systems Branch.
1996b Language Development Program for African-American Students: Literacy and Language, Blueprint for Learning. Division of Instruction, Language Acquisition and Bilingual Development Branch.
1996c The Master Plan for English Learners (Draft). Language Acquisition and Bilingual Development Branch.
1998a Proposition 227 and English Language Development Staff Development Packet.
1998b Inter-Office Correspondence Memo: English Learners and Reading. November 4.
1998c Inter-Office Correspondence Memo: Implementation of Proposition 227. November 25.
1998d Proposition 227 and the Educational Options for Parents of Limited-English-Proficient Students (LEP). District Language Acquisition Branch packet for parents and schools.
1998e Spotlight Newsletter for LAUSD Employees. No. 5. September 8.
1998 Proposition 227 bilingual waiver document.
1998 Finger Tip Facts.
1999-2000 District Intern Program Year 1 Elementary/ Bilingual/ Special Education Class Schedule.
n.d. Language Development Program for African-American Students: Empowering Students Through Communication. Division of Instructional Services, Language Acquisiton and Bilingual Development Branch.
Losey, K.
1995 Mexican-American Students and classroom interaction: An overview and Critique. Review of Educational Research 65(3): 283-318.
Luykx, Aurolyn
1999 The Citizen Factory: Schooling and Cultural Production in Bolivia. New York: State University of New York Press.

Lyons, James J., Esq.
1998 Message from the Executive Director: Impact of Proposition 227 on California Classrooms. NABE News 22(1): 1-3.
MacCannel, Dean
1992 Empty Meeting Grounds: The Tourist Papers. New York: Routledge.
Macedo, Donaldo
1991 The Politics of an Emancipatory Literacy in Cape Verde. *In* Rewriting Literacy: Culture and the Discourse of the Other. Candace Mitchell and Kathleen Weiler, eds. Pp. 147-160. New York: Bergin and Garvey.
Macías, José
1997 National Ideologies, Ethnic Stratification: Political Education and Democratic Futures for German and US Ethnic Communities. Paper delivered at the annual meeting of the American Anthropological Association.
MacLeod, Jay
1987 Ain't No Makin' It: Aspirations and Attainment in a Low-Income Neighborhood. Boulder: Westview Press.
MacSwan, Jeff
2001 Implications of the New York City Schools Research Report for Program-Restrictionist Legislation in the United States. NABE News 24(4): 4-16.
Maharidge, Dale
1999 In California, the Numbers Tell the Story. New York Times, March 29: A25.
Marcus, George E.
1998 Ethnography Through Thick and Thin. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
Marcus, George E. and Michael M.J. Fischer, eds.
1986 Anthropology as Cultural Critique. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
Marrero, Pilar
1999 Proposición 187, parte II: la escuela. La Opinión, October 24: 3A.
Martin, Renée J.
1995 Introduction. *In* Practicing What We Teach: Confronting Diversity in Teacher Education. Renée J. Martin, ed. Pp. xi-xxii. Albany: State University of New York Press.
Martinez, Yleana
1998 Bilingual Education under Siege. Hispanic Magazine, March, pp. 26-29.
Matute-Bianchi, María Eugenia
1979 The Federal Mandate for Bilingual Education. *In* Ethnoperspectives in Bilingual Education Research: Bilingual Education and Public Policy in the United States. Raymond Padilla, ed. Ypsilanti: Eastern Michigan University.
Mauss, Marcel
1954 (1925) The Gift. London: Cohen and West.

McCarthy, Cameron, Alicia Rodriguez, Shuaib Meecham, Stephen David, Carrie Wilson-Brown, Heriberto Godina, K.E. Supryia, and Ed Buendia
1997 Race, Suburban Resentment and the Representation of the Inner City in Contemporary Film and Television. *In* Off White: Readings on Race, Power, and Society. Michelle Fine, Lois Weis, Linda C. Powell, and L. Mun Wong, eds. Pp. 229-241. New York: Routledge.
McCarthy, Cameron
1993 After the Cannon: Knowledge and Ideological Representation in the Multicultural Discourse on Curriculum Reform. *In* Race, Identity and Representation in Education. Cameron McCarthy and Warren Crichlow, eds. Pp. 289-305. New York: Routledge.
McCarthy, Cameron and Warren Crichlow, eds.
1993 Theories of Identity, Theories of Representation, Theories of Race. *In* Race, Identity and Representation in Education. Cameron McCarthy and Warren Crichlow, eds. Pp. xiii-xxix. New York: Routledge.
McDonnell, Patrick
1996 Campaign '96/Issues: California Election Puts Focus On Multiculturalism Concerns. Los Angeles Times, March 20:A5.
McIntosh, Peggy
1989 White Privilege: Unpacking the Invisible Knapsack. *In* Peace and Freedom, July/August: 10-12.
McLean, James E.
1995 Improving Education Through Action Research: A Guide for Administrators and Teachers. Thousand Oaks, California: Corwin Press, Inc..
McQuillan, Jeff, and Lucy Tse
1996 Does Research Matter?: An Analysis of Media Opinion on Bilingual Education, 1984-1994. The Bilingual Research Journal 2(1 Winter): 1-27.
Mead, Margaret
1963 [1935] Sex and Temperament in Three Primitive Societies. New York: Morrow and Quill Paperbacks.
Medina, Eliseo
2000 AFL-CIO: por una nueva amnestia general. La Opinión, May 21: B1.
Menchaca, Martha
1993 Chicano Indianism: A Historical Account of Racial Repression in the United States. American Ethnologist 20(3): 583-603.
1995 The Mexican Outsiders: A Community History of Marginalization and Discrimination in California. Austin: University of Texas Press.
Merriam, Sharan B.
1998 Qualitative Research and Case Study Applications in Education. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
Metz, Mary Haywood
1979 Classrooms and Corridors: The Crisis of Authority in Desegregated Secondary Schools. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Miles, Jack
1992 Blacks Vs. Browns: The Struggle for the Bottom Rung. Atlantic Monthly, October: 41-68.
Mitchell, Candace and Kathleen Weiler, eds.
1991 Rewriting Literacy: Culture and the Discourse of the Other. New York: Bergin and Garvey.
Mora, Jill Kerper
1999 Unz Scathed. LA weekly, December 17-23, p. 6.
Moran, C. and K. Hakuta
1995 Bilingual Education: Broadening Research Perspectives. *In* Handbook of Research on Multicultural Education. J.A. Banks and C. McGee Banks, eds. Pp. 445-462. New York: Macmillan.
Morganthau, Tom
1997 America 2000, Demographics: The Face of the Future. Newsweek, January 27: 58-60.
Morrison, Toni
1992 Playing in the Dark: Whiteness and the Literary Imagination. New York: Vintage Books.
Motzafi-Haller, Pnina
1997 Writing Birthright: On Native Anthropologists and the Politics of Representation. *In* Auto/Ethnography: Rewriting the Self and the Social. Deborah E. Reed-Danahay, ed. Pp. 195-223. New York: Berg.
Moynihan, Patrick
1965 The Negro Family: The Case for National Action. Washington: US Department of Labor.
Mora, Jill Kerper
1999 Unz Scathed, L.A. Weekly, December 17-23: 6.
Morse, Jodie
2000 Sticking to the Script. Time, March 6: 60-61.
Mukhopadhyay, Carol C. and Yolanda T. Moses
1997 Reestablishing "Race" in Anthropological Discourse. *In* American Anthropologist 99(3): 517-533.
Multilingual News [no author listed]
1999 Policy Update: English Learner Population in California's Schools Doubled in Past Ten Years 23(November-December):3.
NABE News [no author listed]
1999 News Clippings. NABE News 23(1): 27.
Narayan, Kirin
1993 How Native Is the Native Anthropologist?
National Education Association
2003 The NEA'S Voice on Teacher Preparedness for English Language Learners. NABE News, March/April: 15-29.

National Review [no author listed]
1992 School's Out. October 5: 19-20.
Navarro, Mireya
2000 Bricks, Mortar And Coalition Building: How Race Is Lived in America. New York Times, July 13: A1, A16.
Nicholas, Fotine
1986 The Pot Melts No More. U.S. News and World Report, June 23: 85.
Niebuhr, Gustav
1999 Across America, Immigration Is Changing the Face of Religion. New York Times, Sept. 23: A16.
Nieto, Sonia
1998 [1994] Affirmation, Solidarity and Critique: Moving Beyond Tolerance in Education. *In* Multicultural Education Magazine, Spring: 997-1008.
Oakland Schoool Board
1996 Ebonics Resolution. December 18.
Oaks, Jeannie
1985 Keeping Track: How Schools Structure Inequality. New Haven: Yale University Press.
O'Connor, Anne-Marie
1999 Learning to Look Past Race. Los Angeles Times, August 25: A1, A9.
Ogbu, John
1978 Minority Education and Caste. San Francisco: Academic Press
1991 Minority Status and Schooling. New York: Garland Publishing.
Ogbu, John and Maria Eugenia Matute-Bianchi
1986 Understanding Sociocultural Factors: Knowledge, Identity, and School Adjustment. *In* Beyond Language. J. Ogbu and M.E. Matute-Bianchi, eds. Pp. 74-141. Los Angeles: Education Dissemination Assessment Center, California State University, Los Angeles.
Olson, Laurie
n.d. Mission: Imperative. Reprinted from California Tomorrow, San Francisco. From Los Angeles County multicultural education professional development program handbook, 1998.
Ong, Aihwa
1996 Cultural Citizenship as Subject-Making: Immigrants Negotiate Racial and Cultural Boundaries in the United States. Current Anthropology 37(5): 737-762.
Omi, Michael and Howard Winant
1994[1986] Racial Formation in the United States From the 1960's to the 1990's. New York: Routledge.
1993 Constructing the 'Other': Rightist Reconstructions of Common Sense. *In* Race, Identity and Representation in Education. Cameron McCarthy and Warren Crichlow, eds. Pp. 3-10. New York: Routledge.

Ovando, Carlos J. and Peter McLaren
Cultural Recognition and Civil Discourse in a Democracy. *In* The Politics of Multiculturalism and Bilingual Education: Students and Teachers Caught in the Cross Fire, pp.xvii-xxiv. Boston: McGraw Hill.
Padilla, Amado M.
1982 Bilingual Schools: Gateways to Integration or Roads to Separation? *In* Bilingual Education for Hispanic Students in the United States. Joshua Fishman and Gary Keller, eds. Pp. 48-70. New York: Teachers College Press.
Padilla, Raymond, ed.
1979 Ethnoperspectives in Bilingual Education Research: Bilingual Education and Public Policy in the United States. Ypsilanti: Eastern Michigan University.
Page, Reba, Yvette J. Samson and Michelle D. Crockette
1998 Reporting Ethnography to Informants. Harvard Educational Review 68(3): 299-334.
Pape, Eric
1999 The Reckoning: The 10th District City Council Race Code Mark the End of an Era. Los Angeles Magazine, April: 26.
Patai, Daphne
1991 U.S. Academics and Third World Women: Is Ethnical Research Possible? *In* Women's Words. D. Patai and G. Berger, eds. Pp. 137-153. New York: Routledge.
Peirce, C. S.
1956 Logic As Semiotic: the Theory of Signs. *In* The Philosophy of Peirce: Selected Writings, J. Buchler, ed. pp. 98-119. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
Peller, Gary
1995 Race Consciousness. *In* Critical Race Theory: The Key Writings That Formed the Movement. Kimberlé Crenshaw, Neil Gotanda, Gary Peller, and Kendal Thomas, eds. Pp.127-158. New York: The New Press.
Perry, Theresa and Lisa Delpit, eds.
1998 The Real Ebonics Debate: Power, Language, and the Education of African-American Children. Boston: Beacon Press.
Philips, Susan
1922 Participant Structures and Communicative Competence: Warm Springs Children in Community and Classroom. *In* Functions of Language in the Classroom. C. Cazden, V. John and D. Hymes, eds. Pp. 370-393**.** New York: Teachers College Press.
Phinney, David and H.G. Reza
1996 OC's Congressmen Support Language Bill Unanimously. Los Angeles Times, Orange County Edition, August 2: A16.
Piatt, Bill
1997 Black and Brown in America: The Case for Cooperation. New York: New York University Press.

Pinar, William
1993 Notes on Understanding Curriculum as a Racial Text. *In* Race, Identity and Representation in Education. Cameron McCarthy and Warren Crichlow, eds. Pp. 60-70. New York: Routledge.
Porter, Rosalie Pedalino
1990 Forked Tongue: The Politics of Bilingual Education. New York: Basic Books.
Pumfrey, John
1989 Multicultural Education Revisited: Towards a Policy for Social Justice. *In* Race Relations and Urban Education: Contexts and Promising Practices. Peter D. Pumfrey and Gajendra K. Verma, eds. Pp. 143-162. New York: The Falmer Press.
Pumfrey, Peter D. Gajendra K. Verma
1989 Introduction: Issues in Urban Education. *In* Race Relations and Urban Education: Contexts and Promising Practices, Peter D. Pumfrey and Gajendra K. Verma, eds. Pp. 1-10. New York: The Falmer Press.
Purdum, Todd S.
2000 Shift in the Mix Alters the Face of California. New York Times, July 4: A1, A12.
Pyle, Amy
1996 Bilingual Classrooms Boost Performance, Study Finds. Los Angeles Times. January 13:A1.
1995 Pressure Grows to Reform Bilingual Education in States Schools. Los Angeles Times, May 22: A1.
Quantz, Richard A.
1992 On Critical Ethnography (with Some Postmodern Considerations). *In* The Handbook of Qualitative Research In Education, Margaret D. LeCompte, Wendy L. Millroy, and Judith Priessle, eds. Pp. 447-506. New York: Academic Press.
Ramirez, David
2000 Proposition 227: Who Wins? Who Loses? Paper presented at the California Association for Bilingual Education, March 21, San Francisco, CA.
Ramirez, Margaret
1999 Hope Grows as Church Struggles to Let Go of Past, Embrace Future. Los Angeles Times, October 30: A1, A22.
Ramos, Francisco
1998 Half of LAUSD teachers support 227? Not nearly. United Teacher XXX (2):14. Los Angeles: United Teachers Los Angeles.
1999 Unz y la asimiliación. La Opinión, August 31: 9A.
Regalia, Martin A.
1999 Immigrants Wanted. New York Times, April 8: A26.
Reed-Danahay, Deborah E., ed.
1997 Auto/Ethnography: Rewriting the Self and the Social. Oxford: Berg.

Reid, Harry
2000 Inmigración y ciudadania. La Opinión, October 6: 9A.
Rice, Vicki
1997 What? So what? Now what? Data Inquiry Tool. Los Angeles: The Achievement Council.
Ricento, Thomas
2000 Proposition 227 and the Future of Antibilingual Education Legislation in the U.S. *In* The Multilingual Educator 1(1): 30-33.
Rocco, Raymond
1997 Citizenship, Culture, and Community: Restructuring in Southeast Los Angeles. *In* Latino Cultural Citizenship. William V. Flores and Rina Benmayor, eds. Pp. 97-123. Boston: Beacon Press.
Rodriguez, Gregory
1998 Going Native: California's Anti-immigration Movement Vanished When Facts Finally Caught Up With Its Apocalyptic Prophecies. Los Angeles Magazine, October: 30.
Rodriguez, Robert
2000 The Salsa Zone. Los Angeles Times, July 9: M1, M6.
Roediger, David
1991 The Wages of Whiteness: Race and the Making of the American Working Class. New York: Verso.
Roman, Leslie G.
1993 White is a Color! White Defensiveness, Postmodernism, and Anti-Racist Pedagogy. *In* Race, Identity and Representation in Education. Cameron McCarthy and Warren Crichlow, eds. Pp. 71-88. New York: Routledge.
1992 The Political Significance of Other Ways of Narrating Ethnography: A Feminist Materialist Approach. *In* The Handbook of Qualitative Research in Education. Margaret de LeCompte, Wendy L. Millroy , and Judith Preissle, eds. Pp. 555-594. New York: Academic Press.
Rosaldo, Renato
1994 Social Justice and the Crisis of National Communities. *In* Colonial Discourse/Postcolonial Theory. P. Hulme et al., eds. Pp. 293-252. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
1997 Cultural Citizenship, Inequality and Multiculturalism. *In* Latino Cultural Citizenship. William V. Flores and Rina Benmayor, eds. Pp. 27-38. Boston: Beacon Press.
Rosenberg, Pearl M.
1997 Underground Discourses: Exploring Whiteness in Teacher Education. *In* Off White: Readings on Race, Power, and Society. Michelle Fine, Lois Weis, Linda C. Powell, and L. Mun Wong, eds. Pp. 79-89. New York: Routledge.
Ryan, William
2002 The Unz Initiatives and the Abolition of Bilingual Education. Boston College Law Review 43: 487-519.

Sachs, Susan
2000 More Screening of Immigrants for TB Sought. New York Times, January 3: A1, A22.
Sadek Sanchez, Carmen
1998 Dos leyes que aseguran el fracaso. La Opinión, December 27, pp. B1, B4.
1999 Cuál es el verdadero problema. La Opinión, October 16: 7A..
Sahagun, Louis
1999a Diversity Challenges Schools to Preserve Racial Harmony. Los Angeles Times, February 14: A1, A33.
1999b Retreat Brings Teachers Face to Face With Other Races—and Themselves: Los Angeles Times, April 7: B2.
1999c Bilingual Teachers May Face Cut in Extra Pay. Los Angeles Times. December 13: B1, B3.
1999d LA Students Take to English Immersion. Los Angeles Times, January 13, pp. A1, A3.
Sahagun, Louis and Nick Anderson
1998 Hundreds Wait for Bilingual Education. Los Angeles Times, October 23, pp. B1, B6.
Sahagun, Louis and Doug Smith
1999 School Board Majority Plans to Oust Zacarias. Los Angeles Times, October 28: A1, A20.
Sahagun, Louis and Duke Helfand
2000 ACLU Sues State Over Conditions in Poor Schools. Los Angeles Times, May 18: A1, A24.
Said, Edward
1985 Opponents, Audiences, Constituencies and Community. *In* Postmodern Culture. Foster, ed. London: Pluto Press.
Sanjek, Roger, ed.
1990 Fieldnotes: The Makings of Anthropology. Press.
Sapir, Edward
1921[1995] Language: An Introduction to the Study of Speech. *In* Language, Culture, and Society: A Book of Readings. Ben G. Blount, ed. Pp. 43-65. Prospect Heights, Illinois: Waveland Press.
Savage, David
1996 English-Only Appeal Goes to Supreme Court. Los Angeles Times, March 26: A1.
Schensul, Jean J. and Stephen L. Schensul
1992 Collaborative Research: Methods of Inquiry for Social Change. *In* The Handbook of Qualitative Research in Education. Margaret D. LeCompte, Wendy L. Millroy and Judith Preissle, eds. Pp. 161-198. San Diego: Academic Press.

Scheper-Hughes, Nancy
1992 Death Without Weeping: The Violence of Everyday Life in Brazil. Berkeley: University of California Press.
1995 The Primacy of the Ethical. Current Anthropology 36(3): Pp. 409-420.
Schneider, David M.
1968 American Kinship: A Cultural Account. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.
Schneider, Jo Anne
1997 Dialect of Race and Nationality: Contradictions and Philadelphia Working-Class Youth. *In* Anthropology and Education Quarterly 28(4): 493-524.
Schmidt, Ronald, Sr.
2000 Language Policy and Identity Politics in the United States. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
Searle, J.
1972 [1965] What is a Speech Act? *In* Language and Social Context. Paolo, Giglioli, ed. Pp. 136-154. New York: Penguin Books.
Seelye, Katherine Q.
1998 Budget Talks Trip Over School Aide and Other Issues, New York Times, October 14: A1-A16.
Segal, Daniel A.
1993 'Race' and 'Color' in Pre-independence Trinidad and Tabago. *In* Trinidad Ethnicity, Kevin A. Yelvington, ed. Pp. 81-115. London: Macmillan Press.
Seller, Maxine and Lois Weis, eds.
1997 Beyond Black and White: New Faces and Voices in US Schools. Albany: State University of New York Press.
Sengupta, Somini
1994 Tough Immigrant Plan Divides California Voters. Newsday, November 7.
Shah, Hemant and Michael C. Thornton
1991 Racial Ideology in US Mainstream News Magazine Coverage of Black-Latino Interaction, 1980-1992. Critical Studies in Mass Communication 11:141-161.
Shor, Ira, ed.
1987 Freire for the Classroom: A Sourcebook for Liberatory Teaching. Portsmouth, NH: Boynton/Cook Publishers.
Shore, Cris and Susan Wright
1997 Policy: A New Field of Anthropolgy. *In* Anthropology of Policy: Critical Perspectives on Governance and Power. Shore, Cris and Susan Wright, eds. Pp. 3-35. London: Routledge.
Shore, Cris and Susan Wright, eds.
1997 Anthropology of Policy: Critical Perspectives on Governance and Power. London: Routledge.

Shuman, Amy
1992 "Get outa my face": Entitlement and Authoritative discourse. *In* Responsibility and Evidence in Oral Discourse. Jane H. Hill and Judith T. Irvine, eds. Pp. 135-161. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Silverstein, Michael
1976 Shifters, Linguistic Categories and Cultural Description. *In* Meaning in Anthropology. Keith Basso and Henry Selby, eds. Pp. 11-55. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press.
Silverstein, Stuart
1999 Crossing Language Barriers. Los Angeles Times, December 8: A1, A34, A35.
2000 U.S. Dividing Into Immigrant Zones, Report Contends. Los Angeles Times, March 9: A33.
Skelton, George
1999 Prop 187 Decision Puts Governor to No-Win Test. Los Angeles Times, March 29: A3.
Slavkin, Mark
2000 Las preguntas que Romer debe hacerse. La Opinión, June 18: 1B, 4B.
Sleeter C. E. and C.A. Grant
1994 Making choices for multicultural education: Five approaches to race, class, and gender in American education. 2nd ed. Columbus: Merrill.
Sleeter, Christine E.
1993 How White Teachers Construct Race. *In* Race, Identity and Representation in Education. Cameron McCarthy and Warren Crichlow, eds. Pp. 157-171. New York: Routledge.
1996 Multicultural Education as Social Activism. Albany: State University of New York Press.
Smith, Howard L. and Paul E. Heckman
1995 The Mexican-American War: The Next Generation. *In* Meeting the Challenge of Linguistic and Cultural Diversity in Early Childhood Education. E. E. García and B. McLaughlin, eds. Pp. 64-83. New York: Teachers College Press.
Smitherman, Geneva
1977 Talkin' and Testifyin': The Language of Black Americans. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
1992 African-Americans and 'English Only.' Language Problems and Language Planning 16:235-248.
2002 Toward a National Public Policy on Language. *In* The Skin That We Speak: Thoughts on Language and Culture in the Classroom. Lisa Delpit and Joanne Kilgour Dowdy, eds. Pp 163-178. New York: The New Press.
Smitherman, Geneva, ed.
1981 Black English and the Education of Black Children and Youth. Detroit: Wayne State University Press.

Smitherman, Geneva and Teun A. Van Dijk, eds.
1988 Discourse and Discrimination. Detroit: Wayne State University Press.
Solá, Michele and Adrian T. Bennet
1991 The Struggle for Voice: Narrative, Literacy, and Consciousness in an East Harlem School. *In* Rewriting Literacy: Culture and the Discourse of the Other. Candace Mitchell and Kathleen Weiler, eds. Pp. 35-56. New York: Bergin and Garvey.
Sowell, Thomas
1991 Promoting Alienization. Forbes, November 25: 112.
Spindler, George
1982 General Introduction. *In* Doing the Ethnography of Schooling: Educational Anthropology in Action. George Spindler, ed. Pp. 1-18. Prospect Heights, Illinois: WaveLand Press.
Spindler, George and Louise Spindler, eds.
1994 Pathways to Cultural Awareness: Cultural Therapy with Teachers and Students. Thousand Oaks: Corwin Press.
Spindler, George, ed.
1982 Doing the Ethnography of Schooling: Educational Anthropology in Action. Prospect Heights, Illinois: WaveLand Press .
Staples, Brent
1999 California Schools, After Affirmative Action. New York Times, August 23: A18.
Steinberg, Jacques
1999 Academic Standards Ease As a Fear of Failure Spreads. New York Times, December 3: A1, A25.
Sterngold, James
2000 A Citizenship Incubator for Immigrant Latinos. New York Times, February 1: A12.
Stolcke, Verena
1995 Talking Culture: New Boundaries, New Rhetorics and Exclusion in Europe. Current Anthropolgy 36(1): 1-24.
Strong, Pauline Turner
1992 Captivity in White and Red: Convergent Practice and Colonial Representation on the British-Amerindian Frontier, 1606-1736. *In* Crossing Cultures: Essays in the Displacement of Western Civilization. Dan Segal, ed. Pp. 33-104. Tucson: The University of Arizona Press.
Takaki, Ronald
1990 Iron Cages: Race and Culture in 19th Century America. New York: Oxford University Press.
Teach For America
1997 Program application brochure.

Thompson, J.
1984 Studies in the Theory of Ideology. Berkeley: University of California Press.
1991 Editor's Introduction. *In* Language and Symbolic Power. Pierre Bourdieu. Pp. 1-31. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
Time special issue
2001 Welcome to Amexica: The border is vanishing before our eyes, creating a new world for all of us. June cover page.
Tobar, Hector
2000 Heartland Tuning In to Spanish. Los Angeles Times, June 23: A1, A18.
Touchman, Gloria Matta
1996 Orange County Voices: Official Language is Best Means for Multiple Cultures to Flourish. Los Angeles Times, August 18: B7.
Tremmel, Robert
1993 Zen and the Art of Reflective Practice in Teacher Education. Harvard Educational Review 63(4): 434-458.
Trueba, Henry T., ed.
1987 Success or Failure? Learning and the Language Minority Student. Cambridge: Newbury House Publishers.
Trujillo, Armando
1996 In Search of Aztlán: Movimiento Ideology and the Creation of a Chicano Worldview Through Schooling. *In* The Cultural Production of the Educated Person: Critical Ethnographies of Schooling and Local Practice. Bradley Levinson, Douglas Foley and Dorothy Holland, eds. Pp. 119-152. Albany: State University of New York Press.
Turner, Kim
1998 In the News: Quick Reads on Issues Teachers Care About: Prop 227 Lawsuit Filed. United Teacher, December 8, p. 2.
Uchitelle, Louis
2000 INS Is Looking the Other Way As the Legal Immigrants Fill Jobs. New York Times, March 9: A1, C14.
Ulichny, Polly and Wendy Schoener
1996 Teacher-Researcher Collaboration from Two Perspectives. Harvard Educational Review 66(3): 496-524.
Unz, Ron
2001 Rocks Falling Upward. National Review Online, October 26. Electronic document.
HTTP://www.nationalreview.com/common/comment-unz102601.shtml.
Unz, Ron and Gloria Matta-Tuchman
1997 English As Required Language of Instruction Initiative Statute. Circulating File No. SA97RF0009. June 26.

Urciuoli, Bonnie
1996 Exposing Prejudice: Puerto Rican Experiences of Language, Race and Class. Boulder: Westview Press.
1997 "Official English" as U.S. cultural defense against a complex world. Paper presented at the conference on "Globalization and Ethnicity." University of Amsterdam, the Netherlands. December 12-13.
Valdés, Armando
1979 The Role of the Mass Media in the Public Debate Over Bilingual Education. *In* Ethnoperspectives in Bilingual Education Research: Bilingual Education and Public Policy in the United States. Raymond Padilla, ed. Pp. 175-188. Ypsilanti: Eastern Michigan University.
Valdés, Guadalupe
1997 Dual-Language Immersion Programs: A Cautionary Note Concerning the Education for Language Minority Students. Harvard Educational Review 67(3): 391-429.
Velásquez, Nydia
1995 Bilingualism Enhances Our Competitiveness. Letter to the Editor, New York Times, December 11: 14A.
Verhovek, Sam Howe
1999 The New Language of American Labor. The New York Times. June 26, P. A8.
Visweswaran, Kamala
1994 Fiction of Feminist Ethnography. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
1998 Race and the Culture of Anthropology. American Anthropologist 100(1): 70-83.
Wagner, Roy
1975 The Invention of Culture. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
Walker, Constance
1987 Hispanic Achievement: Old Views and New Perspectives. *In* Success or Failure? Learning and the Language Minority Student. Henry T. Trueba, ed.**.** Cambridge: Newbury House Publishers.
Walqui-va Lier, Aida
1992 Sheltered Instruction: Doing It Right. From Los Angeles County multicultural education professional development program handbook.
Ward, Janet Schofield
1989 Black and White in School: Trust, Tension or Tolerance? New York: Teachers College Press.
Weber, Max
1949 Objectivity in Social Science and Social Policy. *In* Max Weber on the Methodology of the Social Science. Edward A. Shils and Henry A. Finch, eds. Pp. 49-112. Glencoe: The Free Press.

Weinstein, Brian
1983 The Civic Tongue: Political Consequences of Language Choices. New York: Longman Press.
Weis, Lois
1996 Foreword. *In* The Cultural Production of the Educated Person: Critical Ethnographies of Schooling and Local Practice. Bradley Levinson, Douglas Foley, and Dorothy Holland, eds. Pp. ix-xiv. Albany: State University Press.
West, Cornel.
1990 The New Cultural Politics of Difference. *In* Out There: Marginalization and Contemporary Cultures. Ferguson, Gever, Minh-ha and West, eds. Pp. 19-36. Cambridge: The MIT Press.
1994 Race Matters. New York: Vintage.
Weston, Kath
1998 The Virtual Anthropologist. *In* Anthropological Locations: Boundaries and Grounds of a Field Science. Akhil Gupta and James Ferguson, eds. Pp. 163-184. Berkeley: University of California Press.
Wilcox, Kathleen
1982 Ethnography as a Methodology and Its Application to the Study of Schooling: A Review. *In* Doing the Ethnography of Schooling: Educational Anthropology in Action. George Spindler, ed. Pp. 457-488.
Williams, Brackette F.
1991 Stains On My Name, War In My Veins: Guyana and the Politics of Cultural Struggle. Durham: Duke University Press.
1989 A Class Act: Anthropology and the Race to Nation Across Ethnic Terrain. Annual Review of Anthropology 18:401-444.
Williams, Raymond
1976 Keywords. London: Fontana.
1977 Marxism and Literature. New York: Oxford University Press.
Williams, William Julius
1995 Work. The New York Times Magazine, Pp. 26-53.
Willis, Paul
1977 Learning to Labor: How Working Class Kids Get Working Class Jobs London: Gower.
Winant, Howard
1997 Behind White Eyes: Whiteness and Contemporary U.S. Racial Politics. *In* Off White: Readings on Race, Power, and Society. Michelle Fine, Lois Weis, Linda C. Powell, and L. Mun Wong, eds. Pp. 40-56. New York: Routledge.
Winddance Twine, France
1997 Brown-Skinned White Girls: Class, Culture, and the Construction of White Identity in Suburban Communities. *In* Displacing Whiteness: Essays in Social and Cultural Racism. Ruth Frankenberg, ed. Pp. 214-243. Durham: Duke University Press.

Wrigley, Julia
1982 Class Politics and Public Schools. New Brunswick: Rutgers University
Wolcott, Harry F.
1982 Mirrors, Models, and Monitors: Educator Adaptations of the Ethnographic Innovation. *In* Doing the Ethnography of Schooling: Educational Anthropology in Action. George Spindler, ed. Pp. 69-95. Prospect Heights, Illinois: WaveLand Press.
Woolard, Kathryn A.
1989 Double Talk: Bilingualism and the Politics of Ethnicity in Catalonia. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
Woolard, Kathryn A. and Bambi B. Schiefflelin
1994 Language Ideology. *In* Annual Review of Anthropology 23: 55-82.
Yardley, Johnathan
1994 The Hard Lessons of Bilingual Education. Washington Post, October 24.
Yeo, Frederick L.
1997 Inner-City Schools, Multiculturalism, and Teacher Education: A Professional Journey. New York: Garland Publishing, Inc.
Yon, Daniel A.
2000 Elusive Culture: Schooling, Race and Identity in Global Times. State University of New York Press.
Zachmanoglou, Maria
1994 Bilingual Education Has a Place in Our Culture. New York Times, October 29: 14A.
Zentella, Ana Celia
1990 Returned Migration, Language, and Identity: Puerto Rican Bilinguals in dos worlds/two mundos. International Journal of the Sociology of Language 84: 81-100.
20/20
1996 Transcript #1630-2. ABC 9:00 pm ET, July 26.
[No author listed]
1998 Turning Around Low-Performing Schools: A Guide for State and Local Leaders. Washington D.C.: U.S. Department of Education.

[No author listed]
1999 Doing Right by Immigrants. Los Angeles Times, April 26: B4.
[No author listed]
1999 One Year After 227. Radio show on KPFK 90.7 FM, June 25. 3:50 PM.
[No author listed]
1999 SAT-9 Scores and California's Proposition 227: Drawing Legitimate Inferences Re: It's Impact on Performance of L. E. P. Students. NABE Newsletter 22(8): 1-11.

[No author listed]
2000 Bilingual education fails test. USA Today. August 28. Electronic document. HTTP://www.USAToday.com/news/comment/nceditf2.htm.
[No author listed]
2000 Teachers Wanted. Newsweek, October 2: 37-47.
[no author listed]
2000 USA Today. Electronic document. HTTP://www.USAToday.com/news/comment/nceditf2.htm
[No author listed]
2002 Tongue Tied: Bilingual Education in the Nation of Immigrants. Ed. Magazine, Spring. Electronic document. Cited from HGSE News online. http://www.gse.Harvard.edu/news/features/bilingualed04012002.html

VITA

Kimberly Susan Anderson was born in Ithaca, New York on September 19, 1969, the daughter of Barbara Bond Anderson and Donald Frederick Anderson. After completing her work at Annandale High School, Annandale, Virginia, in 1987, she entered the University of Virginia in Charlottesville, Virginia. She received her Bachelor of Arts in anthropology from the University of Virginia in 1991. Between 1991 and 1994 she worked as a bilingual elementary school teacher in Los Angeles, California. She entered the Los Angeles Unified School District's District Intern alternative credentialing program in 1992, earning her California Clear Professional teaching credential in 1994. In 1995 she entered the Graduate School of The University of Texas at Austin, receiving her Master's degree in anthropology in 1997. While in Austin she was employed by the Charles A. Dana Center for education research, policy and technical assistance, where she participated in and co-authored published reports about research projects on effective programs for Title I schools. From 1998 through 2000, while conducting research for this dissertation, she worked as an elementary school teacher and an instructor in the Los Angeles Unified School District's District Intern alternative credentialing program in Los Angeles, California. From 2000 through the present she has worked as a coach-consultant at a non-profit education policy, advocacy, and technical assistance organization in Los Angeles, California. She has offered numerous papers for presentations at scholarly and community conferences in the fields of anthropology and education.

Permanent Address: 752 North Van Ness Ave., #203, Los Angeles, California, 90038

This dissertation was typed by the author.